

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is some time since we have heard much about the Code of Hammurabi. What is the reason? It cannot be because the comparison between it and the Laws of Moses brought out the originality of the latter, for then we should have been thankfully told so by the believers in a supernatural revelation. Nor can it be because the Laws of Moses were proved to be derived from the Code of Hammurabi, for then the opponents of a supernatural revelation would certainly have published the fact abroad. We have heard little about the Code simply because its study has been so difficult. It has raised several unexpected questions, and even initiated some keen controversies. And scarcely any point in the comparison between it and the Laws of Moses has been placed beyond dispute.

The Rev. C. H. W. JOHNS, M.A., Litt.D., Master of St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, took *The Relations between the Laws of Babylonia and the Laws of the Hebrew Peoples* as the subject of his Schweich Lectures (Humphrey Milford; 3s. net). The Lectures were delivered in 1912. But in publishing them in the end of last year Dr. JOHNS wrote a Preface in which he tells us what are the points in dispute, what progress has been made towards settling them, and what his own opinion is. And Dr. JOHNS has a right to his opinion. He is the author of the first translation

of Hammurabi's Code into English, a translation which is still the best for comparison with the Mosaic Laws; and he has not ceased to study the laws of the Babylonians in their relation to the Laws of Israel from that day until now.

The study of Hammurabi's Code has derived much of its popular interest from the controversies over the criticism of the Old Testament. But it has not been helped by coming into contact with these controversies. Accordingly Dr. JOHNS gets out of that atmosphere as soon as he can. He carries us back for a moment to the days when the Higher Criticism had not been heard of, when the Laws of Moses were adopted by most Christian nations as a direct revelation from God, and accepted by our own King Alfred as the basis of the law of England. He refers to the birth of the Comparative Method, and its rapid rise into favour as a trustworthy weapon of research into the history of human institutions, with the result that the Laws of Moses were compared with the Roman Laws of the XII. Tables, with the Indian Laws of Manu, and with the Greek Code of Gortyna.

But the Comparative Method did not yield all the results that were expected of it. If it settled some controversies, it opened up others. And Jhering, the great authority on Roman Law, was

wondering whether for the elucidation of some of the puzzles in the Code of the XII. Tables, it would not be necessary to go back to the Babylonian Laws, of which very little was then known, when the great system of legislation called the Code of Hammurabi was discovered—a code which was soon found to be not only the oldest code in existence, the most complete, and the best attested, but even the most highly developed, with the exception of those that are quite modern.

It was inevitable that the keenest interest should be taken by scholars in the discovery. It was just as inevitable that it should become the subject of popular debate. For it was at once suggested, and somewhat triumphantly, that the Code of Hammurabi, being at least five hundred years older than the Laws of Moses, was the origin and inspiration of these Laws. And to this day that is the chief interest in the Code. No student can ignore it. Nearly all the writing on the Code in every country is the outcome of it. Dr. JOHNS passes as soon as he can out of the region of controversy regarding the dates and documents of the Old Testament, but his book, from beginning to end, is a comparison between the Code of Hammurabi and the Mosaic Law.

Now there are two types of law in the ancient world. The one may be called 'nomadic,' the other 'agricultural.' That is to say, the one type regulates the affairs of a tribe or people that is still in the wandering or pastoral stage of civilization. The other controls the conduct of a nation that has settled down to an agricultural or commercial life. Both types are seen in the Code of Hammurabi, and both are found in the Law of Moses.

In the Code of Hammurabi there are traces of nomadic law or custom. For the dynasty to which Hammurabi himself belonged had entered Babylonia as conquerors, probably out of the nomadic state. They were Semites. Conquering the Sumerians who were in possession of Babylonia,

they settled among them and ruled over them. And no doubt, as they ruled over them, they imposed some of their laws upon them. But they did not set aside all the laws under which the Sumerians had been living. On the contrary, they would soon find that many of their own customs were ill adapted to their new mode of life, and they would be compelled to adopt to a large extent the laws of the settled subject race. The Code of Hammurabi dates from a period subsequent by a good many years to the entrance of his dynasty into Babylon. It therefore reflects both Semitic nomadic custom and Sumerian settled law.

Precisely similar is the situation in Palestine. The Israelites entered it under Joshua as nomads; they were a pastoral people. The Canaanites whom they found in the land were agriculturists; they had walled cities and they grew crops. The Israelites conquered the Canaanites and retained many of their own customs. Not so many, however, as we have been wont to think. For it is certain that they did not exterminate the Canaanites; and recent excavation in Palestine has shown that more traces of Canaanite than of Israelite life have remained to this day. When the Laws of Moses, as they are called, were codified, they retained traces of the early nomadic life of the Israelites themselves, and we cannot doubt (unless we are to insist upon their codification by Moses in the wilderness) that they contained also many enactments which were adopted from the settled and conquered Canaanites.

This, then, is the first result at which Dr. JOHNS arrives. Both the Babylonian Code of Hammurabi and the Israelite Code of Moses are compromises between two types of law.

And the first result is the last result. Dr. JOHNS is fairly sure of that result. He is not sure as yet of anything else. It is clear that when the further question is asked, Were the Mosaic Laws influ-

enced by the Laws of Hammurabi? there are at least four possibilities. The nomad Israelites may have come into contact with the nomad Babylonians. That is likely enough, for both were Semites, and in the far distances of history they no doubt were one in habitation as in race. Again, the nomad Israelites may have been in touch with the settled Sumerians, or rather with the Babylonians after the Sumerians were conquered by the dynasty of Hammurabi. That also is likely, for the Tell-el-Amarna tablets reveal a far-spreading influence on the part of Babylonia before the time when the Israelites entered Canaan. In the third place, the settled Canaanites may have had legal dealings with either the nomad Babylonians or the settled Sumerians, or both. And this also is probable enough, if it may not be called certain. For the same tablets tell us that the language of Babylonia was the medium of intercourse even between Palestine and Egypt. Last of all, the Israelites after they were settled in Palestine, and before their laws had assumed the form in which they have come down to us, had occasional intercourse with Babylonia.

But all this does not prove the dependence of the Mosaic Law on the Code of Hammurabi. It is sufficient, perhaps, to prove connexion between the two codes—if that much were in need of proof. It is not sufficient to say that the one code is derived from the other. Dr. JOHNS does not believe that the one is derived from the other. He believes rather that however they came in contact, and at whatever time or times, each of the codes must have developed along its own lines, and for the most part independently of the other.

Does the connexion which is probably to be asserted between them account for any of the similarities which they exhibit? These similarities are undoubtedly many and arresting. But 'some very remarkable similarities have been shown by Professor D. H. MÜLLER to exist between the Code of Hammurabi and the Twelve Tables of the Roman Law.' Professor COHN, of Zürich,

has even pointed out strong likenesses between Hammurabi's Code and the laws of the West Goths. These resemblances are not likely, to say the least, to be due to borrowing or a common parentage. More probably they are the result of common human experience expressing itself in legislation.

On the other hand, there are similarities between the Babylonian and the Hebrew Codes that seem as if they must be due to the direct influence of the one on the other. Hammurabi twice orders death by burning. The Law of Moses also inflicts it twice. This might be a mere coincidence if it were an easy matter. But death by burning is a terrible punishment. It was felt by the later Jewish lawyers to be so terrible that they contrived a legal fiction to do away with its literal infliction even on the scandalous criminals for whom it was intended.

And when we consider the crimes for which this horrible punishment was inflicted we see that the correspondence is yet closer. In the one case in Hammurabi's Laws it is incest: it is incest in the Mosaic Law also (Lev 20¹⁴). The other case seems to differ in the two codes. In the Babylonian Code the person that is to be put to death by burning is a votary or vestal virgin who has left her cloister to open a wineshop, or to frequent it for strong drink; in the Hebrew Code (Lev 21⁹) it is the unchaste daughter of a priest.

But the difference is not so great as it seems to be. For in the first place the 'priest's daughter' is evidently more than the daughter of a priest. She is herself a priestess, else why are the other women of the priest's family exempted? In short, she too is what the Babylonian Code calls a votary or vestal virgin. In the second place, in Israel as in Babylonia the keeping of a tavern was closely associated with unchastity. Rahab, the tavern-keeper of the Book of Joshua, was also a harlot. And it is a striking fact that Josephus explains the

crime of the priest's daughter, not as unchastity, but as 'opening a tavern.'

Such likenesses, and there are not a few of them, refuse to resolve themselves into coincidence. They point either to a single original for the two codes, or to the borrowing of one from the other. And if borrowing is the explanation, there can be no doubt which was the borrower and which the lender.

It is often plausible, and it is sometimes true, to say that the Revised Version has missed the rhythm of the English language; it is rarely possible to say that it has missed the meaning of the Hebrew or the Greek. There is one case, however. And it is the more surprising in that it is a clear case of insufficient scholarship. The Revisers believed that the word which ends a famous verse in the Epistle of James is active in meaning; scholars are now unanimous in holding that it is passive.

The verse is this: 'The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.' In the Revised Version the translation is a surprise of difference: 'The supplication of a righteous man availeth much in its working.' The first difference is in the change of 'prayer' into 'supplication.' It is a needless change. The Revisers would not have made it if they had not been under a mild bondage to their rule of using the same English word for the same Greek word. Here the Greek word is different from the ordinary word for 'prayer,' and the Revisers simply tell us so.

The rest of the change, great as it is, is all due to a single word in the Greek. It is the word which ends the sentence, the word *energouménē* (πολὴν ἰσχύει δέησις δικαίου ἐνεργουμένη). The Authorized translators render this word by two adjectives, 'effectual fervent'; the Revisers by a phrase, 'in its working.'

Now if the Authorized translators had left out

the adjective 'effectual,' which creates an awkward tautology with 'availeth,' they would not have been far off the meaning. The Revisers have missed it altogether. They have produced an amazingly feeble statement. How could they allow themselves to think that the Apostle of the style that is terse to obscurity would have been guilty of such a tailing away? Moreover, they have probably made the Apostle say something quite other than he did say. For he did not say that every prayer of a righteous man is of much avail; he said the *fervent* prayer of a righteous man. And finally they have been guilty of a slip in scholarship, as has already been charged against them. In one respect only have they made an improvement on the Authorized translation. They have placed at the end of the sentence their translation of that word which James himself had placed at the end.

If we wished to translate the Greek words literally and in their order, we could not do better than turn to the rendering of Dr. RENDEL HARRIS and adopt it. His rendering is: 'The prayer of a righteous man is of great force [when] energized.' Manifestly the whole virtue of the statement lies in the last word. That is why it is the last word. What does it mean? Dean ARMITAGE ROBINSON thinks it means 'set in operation' by Divine agency. Dr. RENDEL HARRIS remembers that 'real prayer is connected in a most intimate manner with the influences of the Holy Spirit,' and suggests, though with a 'perhaps,' that that is what is meant by 'energized.' But the meaning is not so obvious or so ordinary as these great expositors would have us think. And it is very much more profitable.

St. James speaks of the prayer of a righteous man. Has he any particular righteous man in his mind? Certainly. His great example of the righteous man who prayed and prevailed is Elijah. In the very next verse he says, 'Elijah was a man of like passions with us, and he prayed fervently that it might not rain; and it rained not on the earth for three years and six months. And he prayed

again; and the heaven gave rain, and the earth brought forth her fruit.' Well, what was the characteristic of the prayer of Elijah? Its fervency. 'He prayed fervently,' says the Apostle. He used that peculiar Hebrew idiom 'praying he prayed,' so familiar to us in the Old Testament in spite of its frequent disguise in our English versions.

We have only to turn to our word with this in our mind. 'The prayer of a righteous man is of great force [when] energized'—not merely when energized by the Holy Spirit as every effectual prayer must be; its force comes from the energy that the man himself throws into it. 'The prayer of a righteous man is of great influence when he throws his whole energy into it.' The Apostle has in his mind, and that right vividly, the scene on Mount Carmel after the overthrow of the priests of Baal. 'And Elijah went up to the top of Carmel; and he bowed himself down upon the earth, and put his face between his knees. And he said to his servant, Go up now, look toward the sea. And he went up, and looked, and said, There is nothing. And he said, Go again seven times. And it came to pass at the seventh time, that he said, Behold, there ariseth a cloud out of the sea, as small as a man's hand. And he said, Go up, say unto Ahab, Make ready thy chariot, and get thee down, that the rain stop thee not.'

In Churches in which there is no Liturgy in use there has come a change in the emphasis of prayer within recent years. The emphasis has passed from Confession to Intercession. It is within the memory of many that the first prayer in public worship was called the Long Prayer, and consisted mainly of acts of confession. That prayer is now shortened. It is often shorter than the prayer that follows it, which is known as the Intercessory Prayer. It is impossible to miss the fact of the change. What is the cause of it?

It has two causes. One cause is the discovery of Intercession. With all the ills that this great

war has brought us, it has brought us one good thing—a widespread recognition of the value of Intercession. But the value of Intercession is not a discovery of the war. The Christian conscience has been slowly awakening to the amazing absurdity of prayer to God that begins and ends with self. Slowly it has been awakening to the existence of a world in need, a world to which the arm of only one in a million of us can reach, but which can be gathered into our interests and brought under the influence of our intercessions.

The other cause is the demand for absolute sincerity. Undoubtedly the feeling has been growing that the proper place for Confession of sin is the secret chamber. There is still room for Confession in public. We may still confess our sins as a Church, as a Community, as a Country. But such confession must be general. When the leader in prayer endeavours to confess the sins of the individual sinners before him, it is inevitable that they should feel that, while he is able to recall many an object for Intercession which they had forgotten, he cannot bring to remembrance one in a hundred of the sins of which they have been guilty. And the leader in prayer, knowing this, has felt that it is not possible to confess particular sins and be sincere. For the particular sins he has most acquaintance with are the sins of his own heart and life, and the public worship of God is not the occasion for confessing them.

This, then, we have attained to. We know that the first demand upon us is that our prayer should be sincere. What we have not yet learned, but must now strive to learn, and to practise, is that it must also be energetic. If intercessory prayer is to prevail, if it is to have much influence, we must energize it, we must throw into it the energy of our whole personality.

But before we throw our whole personality into prayer we are arrested with the question of the value of intercession. For if there are difficulties surrounding prayer of every form, the

crowning difficulty is to believe in the value of intercessory prayer. We know that 'he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him,' which is as much as to say, 'If you believe in God, you must also believe in prayer.' But how can *another* be rewarded?

We cannot tell. We can only see that it is so. When the storm came down on the Lake of Galilee, and the boat in which Jesus and His disciples were, tossed by the waves, was in danger of swamping, the disciples prayed, and Jesus heard them. He rose and rebuked the wind, and said to the sea, 'Peace, be still,' and there was a great calm. Is that the whole story? In St. Mark's Gospel there is a sentence which claims our attention. Says St. Mark, 'And there were also with him other little ships.' Why does he tell us that? It is hard to say. But we are glad he tells us. For at once we think of those other little ships having the benefit of the calm. They had felt the storm and were not astonished. For a sudden storm on that lake is very common. But never before had they experienced so sudden and so complete an end to it. They had the benefit of the calm; they were the better for the disciples' prayer, and they did not even know that any one had prayed for them.

We must believe in Intercession as we believe in every other form of prayer. But it must be energized prayer. We must throw our whole personality into it.

We must throw our mind into it. For we must see to it that we are praying for the right things, and that we are praying to the right God.

Are we praying for the right things? St. James says, 'We know not what to pray for as we ought.' As we ought, he says. Suppose we are praying for missions. Do we know *what* we are praying for? Success, we say. What is success? Success in what? Do we know what missions are for? Do

we know with any clearness what the missionaries are doing? Do we know any mission or any missionary intimately? Without some real knowledge we cannot pray as we ought, because we do not know what to pray for.

But we must also pray to the right God. In the present war nothing perhaps has occurred to shake the faith of the believer in Christ—at any rate of the half-believer—more than the reported prayers of the German Emperor. What is wrong with them? No one who has put his mind into the matter will answer and say 'insincerity.' What is wrong with them is that they are offered to the wrong God. They are offered to a God who is not the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. They are offered to a German God. But the true God has no respect of persons or of nations.

Again, we must throw our feelings into our prayer. This is the most obvious evidence of energy in prayer. And we are too timid about it. Hezekiah, the great king, prayed so energetically that the tears ran down his face. So did Nehemiah, the aristocratic governor. So did Paul, the once proud Pharisee. We are more careful to hide our emotions. Are we as careful to have them?

Last of all, we must throw our will into our prayer. Now there is no way of throwing the will into prayer that is so mighty in making prayer a force as the way of answering our own prayer. This is not a way of escape from the difficulties of prayer. It is not another form of the lame conclusion that whatever else prayer does it does good to those who pray. This is one of God's ways of answering prayer.

There is nothing more certain than that God often gives us the opportunity of answering our own prayers. And surely there can be nothing more gracious. For in this way prayer does do good to the man who prays, and a very much

greater good than the comfortable feeling that it is a good thing to pray, which is all that some of us seem to think can be got with certainty out of it. Does it cost something to fulfil one's own prayers? That is where the good of it lies. One may say with scarcely a reserve that its good is just in proportion to its sacrifice.

There is no finer example of how we may have the gracious opportunity of answering our own prayers than that which occurs in the record of the early life of Dr. HUDSON TAYLOR—*Hudson Taylor in Early Years*, page 133. It is a long story, but to abridge it would be to lose the flavour of its gentle sincerity. This is the story: 'After concluding my last service about ten o'clock that night, a poor man asked me to go and pray with his wife, saying that she was dying. I readily agreed, and on the way to his house asked him why he had not sent for the priest, as his accent told me he was an Irishman. He had done so, he said, but the priest refused to come without a payment of eighteen pence, which the man did not possess, as the family was starving. Immediately it occurred to my mind that all the money I had in the world was a solitary half-crown, and that it was in one coin; moreover, that while the basin of water-gruel I usually took for supper was awaiting me, and there was sufficient in the house for breakfast in the morning, I certainly had nothing for dinner on the coming day.

'Somehow or other there was at once a stoppage in the flow of joy in my heart. But instead of reproving myself I began to reprove the poor man, telling him that it was very wrong to have allowed things to get into such a state as he described, and that he ought to have applied to the relieving officer. His answer was that he had done so, and was told to come at eleven o'clock next morning, but that he feared his wife might not live through the night.

"Ah," thought I, "if only I had two shillings and a sixpence instead of this half-crown, how gladly would I give these poor people a shilling!" But to part with the half-crown was far from my

thoughts. I little dreamed that the truth of the matter simply was that I could trust God plus one and sixpence, but was not prepared to trust Him only, without any money at all in my pocket.

'My conductor led me into a court, down which I followed him with some degree of nervousness. I had found myself there before, and at my last visit had been roughly handled. My tracts had been torn to pieces, and such a warning given me not to come again that I felt more than a little concerned. Still, it was the path of duty, and I followed on. Up a miserable flight of stairs into a wretched room he led me; and oh, what a sight there presented itself! Four or five children stood about, their sunken cheeks and temples all telling unmistakably the story of slow starvation, and lying on a wretched pallet was a poor, exhausted mother, with a tiny infant thirty-six hours old moaning rather than crying at her side, for it too seemed spent and failing.

"Ah," thought I, "if I had two shillings and a sixpence, instead of half a crown, how gladly should they have one and sixpence of it." But still a wretched unbelief prevented me from obeying the impulse to relieve their distress at the cost of all I possessed.

'It will scarcely seem strange that I was unable to say much to comfort these poor people. I needed comfort myself. I began to tell them, however, that they must not be cast down; that though their circumstances were very distressing there was a kind and loving Father in heaven. But something within me cried, "You hypocrite! telling these unconverted people about a kind and loving Father in heaven, and not prepared yourself to trust Him without half a crown."

'I was nearly choked. How gladly would I have compromised with conscience, if I had had a florin and a sixpence! I would have given the florin thankfully and kept the rest. But I was not yet prepared to trust in God alone, without the sixpence.

'To talk was impossible under these circumstances, yet strange to say I thought I should have no difficulty in praying. Prayer was a delightful

occupation in those days. Time thus spent never seemed wearisome, and I knew no lack of words. I seemed to think that all I should have to do would be to kneel down and pray, and that relief would come to them and to myself together.

"You asked me to come and pray with your wife," I said to the man, "let us pray." And I knelt down.

"But no sooner had I opened my lips with "Our Father who art in heaven" than conscience said within, "Dare you mock God? Dare you kneel down and call Him Father with that half-crown in your pocket?"

'Such a time of conflict then came upon me as I have never experienced before or since. How I got through that form of prayer I know not, and whether the words uttered were connected or disconnected I cannot tell. But I arose from my knees in great distress of mind.

'The poor father turned to me and said, "You see what a terrible state we are in, sir. If you can help us, for God's sake do!"

'At that moment the word flashed into my mind, "Give to him that asketh of thee." And in the word of a King there is power.

'I put my hand into my pocket, and slowly drawing out the half-crown, gave it to the man, telling him that it might seem a small matter for me to relieve them, seeing that I was comparatively well off, but that in parting with that coin I was giving him my all; what I had been trying to tell them was indeed true—*God* really was a *Father* and might be trusted. The joy all came back in full floodtide to my heart. I could say anything and feel it then, and the hindrance to blessing was gone—gone, I trust, for ever.

'Not only was the poor woman's life saved; but my life, as I fully realized, had been saved too. It might have been a wreck—would have been, probably, as a Christian life—had not grace at that time conquered, and the striving of God's Spirit been obeyed.

'I well remember how that night, as I went home

to my lodgings, my heart was as light as my pocket. The dark, deserted streets resounded with a hymn of praise that I could not restrain. When I took my basin of gruel before retiring, I would not have exchanged it for a prince's feast. I reminded the Lord as I knelt at my bedside of His own Word, "He that giveth to the poor lendeth to the Lord"; I asked Him not to let my loan be a long one, or I should have no dinner next day. And with peace within and peace without, I spent a happy, restful night.'

We have said that when God gives us the opportunity of answering our own intercession the benefit is ours. So Dr. HUDSON TAYLOR found. But the benefit is also His. For in that way is the gospel preached, in that way does the Kingdom of God make progress. What tells for God more than character? What makes us sure of the love of God more than our experience of the love of man?

Ye are always singing the good Lord's praise,
And publishing all that His hand
Has wrought for you in the bygone days,
And all that His heart has planned.

And verily all that ye say is true;
For I gratefully confess
That whatever the Lord has done for you
He has done for me no less.

But when I remember the weary ways
Which my feeble feet have trod,
And the human love which all my days
Has helped me along the road,
Then the love of man is my song of praise
As well as the love of God.

And I hardly think that I would have seen
The love of God so clear,
Unless the love of man had been
So visible and near.

Fresh Light on the Book of Daniel.

BY THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, LL.D., LONDON.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June last year (p. 420) I gave, under the heading 'Glimpses of Life in Erech,' an account of some new inscriptions from that ancient and renowned city, gleaned from some of the tablets of the collection belonging to Mr. W. Harding Smith. An examination of a further instalment of tablets in the same collection has revealed the existence of other documents of a semi-historical nature, the contents of which will probably rejoice the hearts of many who have found in the Book of Daniel a stumbling-block to their faith.

As will be remembered, the tablets from Erech in the collection in question are mainly contracts; and such, in fact, is the nature of the new texts which I now bring to the notice of scholars. This, naturally, is somewhat disappointing, for we should all like to come across further material of the nature of the Babylonian Chronicle, to which we have been mainly indebted for details of Nabonidus' reign hitherto. Our consolation, however, is that the new material belongs to a class which cannot mislead us—written for the day whose date they bear, their chronological indications, as well as the accompanying historical and other information, should seem to be absolutely unimpeachable.

The important tablets are two in number. The earlier measures $1\frac{11}{16}$ in. high by $2\frac{5}{32}$ in. long, and is inscribed with 21 lines of writing. The clay is apparently unbaked, and being soft, worms have tunnelled holes through it, and in one place near the lower edge of the obverse, the points of entry and exit are visible. As, however, the damaged portions can, in most cases, be restored, the full translation may be given as follows:—

'Iši-Amurrū, son of Nūrānu, has sworn by Bêl, Nebo, the Lady of Erech,¹ and Nanâ, the oath of Nabonidus, king of Babylon, and Belshazzar, the king's son, that, "on the 7th day of the month Adar of the 12th year of Nabonidus, king of Babylon, I will go to Erech, to the presence of Zêrî, steward of Ê-anna, and the (priests?) of

Ê-anna, and the business of cattle-raising for the Lady of Erech, which is mine (*ina pania*), I will perform in Ê-anna." If, on the 7th day of the month Adar, Iši-Amurrū does not perform (*lâ itepšu*) the business of cattle-raising with the steward and the priests of Ê-anna, he will commit a sin against the king' (*hiṭi ša šarri išaddad*).

Here follow the names of three witnesses, and that of the scribe. The date reads:

'City Maḥrâ, additional month of Adar, day 22nd, year 12th, Nabonidus, king of Babylon.'

(From this text it would seem that the additional Adar came before, and not after, Adar proper—it was on the 7th of the real Adar that Iši-Amurrū was to perform his vow.)

The importance of this inscription is that it places Belshazzar practically on the same plane as Nabonidus, his father, five years before the latter's deposition, and the bearing of this will not be overlooked. Officially, Belshazzar had not been recognized as king, as this would have necessitated his father's abdication, but it seems clear that he was in some way associated with him on the throne, otherwise his name would hardly have been introduced into the oath with which the inscription begins. We now see that not only for the Hebrews, but also for the Babylonians, Belshazzar held a practically royal position. The conjecture as to Daniel's being made the third ruler in the kingdom because Nabonidus and Belshazzar were the first and second is thus confirmed, and the mention of Belshazzar's 3rd year in Dn 8¹ is explained.

We have yet to learn what was the exact position of Belshazzar in the kingdom of Babylonia, but though he was, in the earlier part of his father's reign, with the army in Akkad, he constantly went, it may be conjectured, to Babylon, and contracts exist showing that he acquired property there. One point is noteworthy, namely, that his secretary, Nabû-kain-âḫi,² borrowed 45 shekels of silver, which is described as having been 'tithe of Bêl, Nebo, Nergal, and the Lady of Erech.' This, however, was not borrowed directly, but from Nabû-ṣabit-qatê, Belshazzar's major-domo, and was apparently

¹ Istar. 'The Lady of Erech and Nanâ' are also mentioned in the inscriptions translated in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June 1914, pp. 420-422.

² Or Nabû-takin-uṣur.

repaid through Nabû-âhê-iddina, a descendant of Egibi.¹ In this transaction between the members of Belshazzar's household, there is probably no indication that the invocation of Ištar of Erech in Mr. Harding Smith's tablet was due to special connexions with the temple of the goddess in that city. 'The Lady of Erech' referred to in the British Museum text implies rather her temple at Babylon, where were also temples to the other deities mentioned—Bêl (Merodach), Nebo, and Nergal.

Naturally the existence of inherited authority might be of use in settling the question of any royal title applied to Belshazzar, and in this matter it may be well to refer again to the contract in which a seemingly blundering copyist has applied to a certain Nabonidus (he who afterwards became king of Babylonia?) the title 'son of the king of the city,' replacing 'he who is over the city' in the more correct copy. Though this is of no great value for the title 'king of the Chaldeans,' which is given to Belshazzar in Daniel, his being in residence at Babylon at the time Nabonidus, his father, was captured, implies that he may have been governor of the city, and therefore possessed authority which would otherwise have belonged to the king. This the later tablet, which I shall now describe, shows to have been customary at this period, if not at other times.

Unlike the tablet associating Nabonidus and Belshazzar, the second text is in an excellent state of preservation—well written and carefully baked. There is, it is true, slight damage to the reverse, but this only affects the list of witnesses, leaving the text proper intact. Its height is $1\frac{7}{16}$ in., and its length $2\frac{3}{2}$ in.; colour greyish-red.

This inscription runs as follows:—

'At the end of the month Chisleu, 4th year of Cambyses, king of Babylon and the lands, Ardîa,² son of Nabû-banî-âhî, descendant of Rêmut-Êa, the man who is over the date-offerings of Ištar of Erech, will take 5 talents of early fruit, and deliver them, in the palace of the king, which is situated above Ê-anna, to Nabû-âha-iddina, the king's

¹ Further details are given—*i.e.* the money was borrowed to purchase Nabû-ikribi-šime, a slave, and the transaction took place in the presence of the borrower's wife, Didîtu^m. One of the witnesses was 'Arša'u, son of Kudma-âbi, slave of Belshazzar, the son of the king.' The date is: 'Sebat, day 9th, year 7th, Nabonidus, king of Babylon.'

² See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June 1914, p. 422, col. 1.

captain (*sak šarri* or *rêš šarri*), lord of Ê-anna's contribution. If he does not bring (the amount), he will commit a sin against Gobryas, governor of Babylon (*hiṭu ša Gubarru, âwel piḫāti Bābili, inamdin*). Besides the balances which are against them, they shall give an amount of 100 *gidimu*.'

Here follow the names of three witnesses and the scribe. The date runs:

'Erech, month Marcheswan, day 9th, year 4th, Cambyses, king of Babylon, king of the lands.'

The above inscription will show the importance of the question, whether Belshazzar was governor of Babylon—'king of the city'—or not. It is to be noted that the dates were for the royal palace in Erech, but if they were not delivered, the wrong committed is not described as being against Cambyses, but Gobryas, and the importance of this point will not be overlooked. Noteworthy, also, is the fact that he was still governor of Babylon in the 4th year of Cambyses—thirteen years after he took the city for Cyrus—and his possessing authority at Erech implies that he occupied a position which would be best described by the words 'Babylonian viceroy.' Babylonia and Assyria, at this time, were simply provinces of the great Persian Empire. The reference to the 3rd year of Cyrus in Dn 10¹ implies, however, that 'Darius the Mede,' son of Ahasuerus (a certain Xerxes), may not have been governor of Babylon and viceroy all the time. The age attributed to Darius the Mede in Daniel, 62 years, would make Gobryas (whom we must identify with him) to have been 75 at the time this tablet was written. Tiele's objection, that Cyrus would not have given power in Babylonia to a Mede, says nothing against the identification, as Gobryas, in the Babylonian Chronicle, is distinctly stated to have been governor of Gutium^m, a part of ancient Media. According to Xenophon, Gobryas possessed all the fidelity with which Orientals are often credited, for though he had no small hatred for Belshazzar, he remained faithful to Nabonidus to the end. He seems, however, to have regarded Belshazzar as the murderer of his son, hence the conflict in or near the royal palace at Babylon, and the death of this last representative of Babylonia's royal house.

How far Xenophon's account (*Cyropedia*, iv. 6) is correct, we do not know, but it is exceedingly interesting. That Gobryas should describe himself as an Assyrian (= Babylonian) seems most improbable, not only on account of the statement in

the Babylonian Chronicle, but also on account of his name and its varying forms.¹ Perhaps, however, he regarded himself as an Assyrian (= Babylonian) because he was a vassal of Nabonidus, in which case the expression would simply mean that he was a Babylonian subject.

¹ *Gubaru*, *Gubarru*, and *Ugbaru*, which, it might be argued, show that the pronunciation was *G'baru*. The Greek Gobryas, on the other hand, implies a form like *Gubru*.

But the important point in this second inscription is the statement that Gubarru (Gobryas) was governor of Babylon, and that he was the person sinned against if Ardîa failed to deliver the 5 talents of dates required for the royal palace at Erech. As the official replacing the king, he evidently had royal power, and this tablet, like that mentioning Belshazzar, adds one more to the arguments that the Book of Daniel may not be so incorrect, historically, as it is commonly held to be.

National Hate.

BY THE REV. JOHN PINKERTON, B.D., EDINBURGH.

'For the day of the Lord is near upon all the heathen : as thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee : thy reward shall return upon thine own head.

'And saviours shall come up on mount Zion to judge the mount of Esau ; and the kingdom shall be the Lord's.'—Ob ^{15, 21}.

'Love your enemies.'—Mt 5⁴⁴.

WE have heard much recently of a Hymn of Hate. That production has been received by some as if nothing similar to it had ever been made before. However true that impression may be in one respect, in another it is not well founded. This is not the first century in which nations have regarded each other with hatred. Two thousand five hundred years ago there were two peoples who hated each other with an extreme and lasting hate, and some writings, in which that hate was expressed, have found a place in the world's literature. These two peoples were the Hebrews and the Edomites. Their lands bordered each other in southern Palestine, and between them an intermittent warfare was waged for centuries. The hatred of the Hebrews against the Edomites found expression in many a hymn and prophecy, some of which are now preserved in the Hebrew Scriptures, *e.g.* the prophecy of Obadiah. There were doubtless many such of Edomite origin, but Time has robbed us of them all.

The hatred between these two peoples was remarkable in view of their many common interests. Racially they were closely related to each other. Obadiah and others speak of the relationship as that of brothers. 'Look not thou on the day of thy brother,' says Obadiah ; and Amos accuses

Edom of having pursued his brother with the sword. This intimate connexion is also witnessed to by the story that Jacob and Esau, the ancestors from whom these two peoples were descended, were twins. The languages they spoke belonged to the same stock, and, so far as we know, differed little from each other. Recent investigation has shown that certain of their religious practices were identical. Their position as buffer-states between two great empires—Egypt on the west, and Assyria or Babylonia on the east—strongly suggested that instead of wasting their powers in mutual strife they should unite their forces for mutual protection. But no ! their animosity only increased with the passing centuries, so much so that the harm of the one was the joy of the other. It was with tumultuous gladness, Obadiah tells us, that the Edomites greeted the conquest of Judæa by the Babylonians in 586. To show how Israel reciprocated this hate, it need only be said that never do we find such hard things said about Babylon for all the sufferings it imposed on the Hebrews, as we find said about Edom.

What gave rise to this 'perpetual hatred,' as Ezekiel calls it, is unknown to us. It is certain that the Edomites were in many ways a favoured people. Their land though wild and mountainous contained many fertile valleys, and their position on one of the great trade-routes of the East—the route between Arabia and Asia Minor—enabled them to accumulate wealth as 'middlemen.' This may at times have excited the jealousy and cupidity of the Hebrews.

But the 'perpetual hatred' was probably due to

a deeper cause. The Edomites, as a people, seem to have been concerned mainly about what they should eat, and what they should drink, and where-withal should they be clothed. In the character of the patriarch Esau we have the typical Edomite—a man taking no thought of the future, making light of birthrights and inherited powers, when material pleasures were at stake. They had no use for a people like the Hebrews, who felt they had a destiny, and were endeavouring to have that destiny realized. Edom wanted to make Israel subservient to its plans for money-making. Israel resented the interference of Edom, and the feud thus begun deepened to a hatred almost unparalleled in the history of man. The wrong done by Edom to Israel was further aggravated by the fact that the people who might have been expected to give sympathy and support gave nothing but antipathy and contempt. Israel asked for bread, and received a stone.

History often repeats itself, and to-day the world again sees the spectacle of two kindred nations hating each other with a cordial hatred. Of the fact that at least a large part of the German people hates this nation, there is incontestable proof. As to ourselves there is much ground for believing that the exasperation felt by this people at the reckless way in which Germany plunged Europe into war is deepening into a more intense and fierce passion. Yet Britons and Germans are descended from a common Teutonic stock. The two languages are not widely different from each other. Commercially and industrially they have been closely connected. In view, therefore, of their many common interests, there is ground for wonder at the feelings of hate which exist between the two peoples. The situation which confronts us now bears so many resemblances to that which existed between Israel and Edom, that a consideration of their relationship cannot but be of advantage.

I. The nation whose greatest inspiration is a hatred, is doomed.

History has two outstanding facts to record about the Edomites: (1) they were great haters; (2) they have perished.

I think that we may with assurance believe these two facts to be related to each other somewhat as cause and effect.

Of the manifestations of the human spirit, hatred

is one of the most evil. It is like a noxious weed of rank growth, which getting root in a good garden gradually overruns it and reduces it to waste. Hatred warps the judgment and spoils the nature. It narrows the outlook—any one who knows a man who has a great grudge knows that that man's outlook is narrow. So absorbed is he in one interest, and that an evil one, that he ceases to develop his other spiritual capacities, and loses the power of appreciating other and higher interests. Hatred can thus result in the destruction of all the finer qualities of the spiritual nature of men. Just as an offence against the laws that govern the physical universe, *e.g.* the law of gravitation, means the injury of the offender, so an offence against those laws which control the spiritual universe involves the offender in spiritual injury. Hatred by reason of the way in which it makes the spiritual nature weak and imperfect constitutes an offence against the spiritual well-being of mankind, and with inevitable force the laws governing the spiritual universe work the destruction of the offender.

Edom hated Israel with a bitter hatred, but the main result of that hatred was the destruction of Edom. Edom had no love for the high things of which Israel at its best was in search, and it gradually lost the power of appreciating these things. The only inspiring motive which Edom had was hatred of all who sought high inspiration. The end was sure: no nation can live by hate, for hate blights. 'Where there is no vision, the people perish.' There was no vision in Edom, and Edom perished—a warning to all that the nation whose one inspiration is a great hatred, is doomed.

This hatred on the part of those whose tastes are material and earthy against those who can and do appreciate what is true and noble and spiritual, has been manifested by many races and classes other than the Edomites. Perhaps it has had no clearer illustration than the hatred felt by the world to Christ and His followers.

In St. John's Gospel this hatred is compared to the opposition between light and darkness. Christ says: 'And this is the condemnation that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light.' Again He says: 'The world hath hated me.' But such hatred is futile—it works its own

destruction. While Israel has lived, Edom has perished. The darkness of the pagan world is steadily vanishing before the light of the gospel. And it will be the same always. Even to-day as we know it to be in Germany, where a people is living in hatred of those who esteem what mankind acknowledges to be the highest and the best, there, we may be assured, the principle is operating, and such a people is working its own hurt.

Such a reading of the past is eloquent in its warning to us that by allowing our present feelings of resentment to deepen into hate, we would only be doing ourselves a great wrong.

II. *The saving power of a nation at a time when the hatred of other peoples is set against it, is a firm belief in the justice of the government of the universe.*

In many respects Edom was stronger than Israel. The land was practically impregnable, and the people possessed material resources which Israel never enjoyed. Yet it was Israel which prevailed in the long-drawn conflict. Against great odds it sustained itself by an indomitable belief that justice would be done to it, and that the cause which it championed would yet be acknowledged as right. This belief was expressed in passionate appeals to God to manifest His power in deliverance and to hasten the day of the Lord, or in a confident expectation that soon the might of God would prevail. Obadiah expresses this hope thus: 'And saviours shall come up on mount Zion to judge the mount of Esau; and the kingdom shall be the Lord's.'

There is much in human experience which seems to give the lie to the belief that there is an order in the universe, and that it is a just order. But deep down in the human breast there is the belief that, even because we have the knowledge of justice, there must be justice somewhere in this universe. Faith in justice and in the rationality of existence was strong in the Hebrew mind, and sustained it in spite of much trial. And a like faith has been found in every people or class or age which has been firmly persuaded of the truth which it professes, whatever that truth be. The early Christians were firmly convinced that the way of life in Jesus Christ was the highest life for man, and in the face of much persecution they held to that conviction. They believed that the

world was founded on justice, and that all that was in accordance with the righteousness of God, revealed in Christ, must prevail because of this justice. Without this faith they would have failed. And their faith is being more fully justified each succeeding century.

But this belief in the Divine justice must be large enough to allow for a disciplining of one's own people or class. The people that thinks that God's judgments ought to fall only on other peoples, is probably just the very people by whom they are most required. The spiritual greatness of the Hebrew prophets is visible in nothing so much as in their recognition that the judicial processes of the Almighty would act adversely on their own people. They realized that there is no respect of persons with God, and that no people—no, not even Israel—had entirely succeeded in becoming 'the kingdom of God on earth.' The justice of God which saved Israel from Edom's hate also disciplined Israel.

We are at the present time oppressed with the hate of a great foe. His determination and resources might well induce feelings of disquiet. But strength and comfort can most surely be found in a steadfast faith in the justice of the world's government. We feel ourselves to be the custodians of certain ideals—ideals of honour, purity, and brotherhood, ideals of which our foe thinks lightly, and hates us for thinking highly. But as there is justice at the basis of the world's government, it must be that these ideals will prevail, that we shall be saved, and that the enemy's hate will result only in his shame.

Let us, however, also frankly recognize that that same justice may have to deal with us in discipline. Let us remember that we are fighting not only or mainly for the integrity of the British Empire—we are fighting for *purity and honour*. But before purity and honour can be established on the earth, the just God above who rules the destiny both of Britain and of Germany will have to discipline this people, so that all that is impure and dishonourable may be banished from our midst. As long as the 'white slave' haunts our streets, or the fraudulent financier our markets, our claim to be the defenders of purity and honour is in some measure weakened. We can be sure that the justice of God, which can and will protect us from the hate of a vengeful foe, will also chastise us for the sin that is in us.

III. *The justice of God is vindicated, not in the destruction, but in the salvation or perfecting of all who hate.*

The leaders of Hebrew thought believed that God would vindicate His justice in the extermination of those who hated His servants. Accordingly their almost constant prophecy was that the day of the Lord, the day of doom and death, was coming upon their foes. In entertaining such ideals they revealed one of the limitations under which they lived. 'Love thy neighbour, and hate thy enemy,' was the law they followed. They lived under a dispensation which had not outgrown the old law of retribution—'An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth.'

But since their time a new dispensation, associated with the life and work of Jesus, has been inaugurated, and its law is 'Love your enemies.' Jesus asserts that, not by hating one's enemy, but by loving one's enemy, is the justice of God to be vindicated. Reflexion shows that this wonderful command is right, this amazing statement true. What do we mean by the justice of God? God's justice is His sense of what is right and true and perfect, and His desire that all things shall be right and true and perfect in the world He has made. Now the man (or the nation) devoted to hate is, we have seen, imperfect, but his imperfection is not going to be remedied by his destruction,

any more than an imperfection in his eye-sight is to be remedied by taking out his eye. 'The imperfection of his hate will be remedied only by the development of those capacities which are temporarily overcome by his hate. God does not execute His justice by destroying men, but by changing and transforming men. And to change a man or a world there is no power equal to the power of love—that love which is sometimes disciplinary, is always wise, and is never destructive.'

Under this new dispensation we live. We are baptized in the name of Him who inaugurated it, and at His table we have pledged ourselves to His cause. If we would be worthy followers, we shall never go back to that Old Testament time and pray for a Day of the Lord to destroy them who hate us, but in all our dealings with our enemy, yea, in our fighting with him, we shall act in love, and not in hate. We shall strive earnestly for the victory, because our victory will be for the disciplining of our foe, but we shall always entertain towards him larger and nobler feelings than he now entertains towards us. We shall look forward to the time when the exercise of the more kindly offices of love shall be possible, and when by these that which is now imperfect shall be supplied and made perfect, when justice—God's justice, not man's justice—shall prevail on the earth, and 'the kingdom shall be the Lord's.'

Literature.

ZEUS.

THE most important contribution to the comparative study of Religion since the completion of Dr. Farnell's *Cults of the Greek States* has been made by Mr. A. B. Cook, Reader in Classical Archæology to the University of Cambridge. It is the first of two volumes entitled *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion* (Cambridge: At the University Press; 45s. net).

'It would seem that the Greeks, starting from a sense of frank childish wonder, not unmixed with fear, at the sight of the animate sky, mounted by slow degrees of enlightenment to a recognition of the physical, intellectual, and moral supremacy of the sky-god. Dion Chrysostomos in a memorable

sentence declared Zeus to be "the giver of all good things, the Father, the Saviour, the Keeper of mankind." On the lower levels and slopes of this splendid spiritual ascent the Greeks found themselves at one with the beliefs of many surrounding peoples, so that a fusion of the Hellenic Zeus with this or that barbaric counterpart often came about. On the higher ground of philosophy and poetry they joined hands with a later age and pressed on towards our own conceptions of Deity. I have therefore felt bound to take into account not only the numerous adaptations of Levantine syncretism but also sundry points of contact between Hellenism and Christianity.'

In these words Mr. Cook shows at once how vast is the subject he has undertaken to study, and

gives us a hint of how difficult it is. 'It is obvious,' he adds, 'that the limits of such an enquiry are to a certain extent arbitrary. I shall expect to be told by some that I have gone too far afield, by others that I have failed to note many side-lights from adjacent regions. Very possibly both criticisms are true.' Yes, both criticisms are true. Reading over again two or three of the articles which Professor Paton has contributed to the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*—the articles on the Ammonites, on Ashtart and on Atargatis, on Baal, on the Canaanites, on Dagan, and on Ishtar—we recall points of contact with the worship of Zeus which we should have been glad if Mr. Cook had given more attention to. Very likely Semitic scholars will one and all be on the side of those who say that he has 'failed to note certain side-lights from adjacent regions.' But, on the other hand, the general student of Religion, as distinct from the special student of one department, will be sure to think that this great book, which is meant for him, is more than sufficient to give him a working acquaintance with the cult of a single god.

But Mr. Cook not only anticipates criticism, he disarms it. With much frankness he tells us how hard he has found it to draw the limits of his subject and to discover the best method of pursuing it. The present reviewer read carefully and made elaborate notes of certain articles which Mr. Cook contributed to the *Classical Review* in 1903 and 1904; and he was surprised and a little disappointed to find that the method pursued in these articles had not been carried out in the volume now published. But the reason given is good. These articles were directly intended to support Sir J. G. Frazer's Arician hypothesis, so well known to the readers of the *Golden Bough*. Being satisfied that the evidence for that hypothesis was stronger than he at first anticipated, Mr. Cook pursued the theme into the Celtic, Germanic, and Letto-Slavonic areas. 'With that intent,' he says, 'I wrote another series of eight articles on "The European Sky-God" which appeared in *Folk-Lore* between the years 1904 and 1907. Of these articles the first three restated, with some modifications, the results obtained on Græco-Italic ground; and the remaining five were devoted to a survey of analogous phenomena among the Insular Celts. I had meant to go further along the same road. But at this point Dr. Farnell in the friendliest fashion put a

spoke in my wheel by convincing me that the unity of an ancient god consisted less in his nature than in his name. Thereupon I decided to abandon my search for "The European Sky-God"; and I did so the more readily because I had felt with increasing pressure the difficulty of discussing customs and myths without a real knowledge of the languages in which they were recorded. After some hesitation I resolved to start afresh on narrower lines, restricting enquiry to the single case of Zeus and marking out my province as explained in the previous paragraph. Even so the subject has proved to be almost too wide. I incline to think that a full treatment of any of the greater Greek divinities, such a treatment as must ultimately be accorded to them all, properly demands the co-ordinated efforts of several workers.'

The last statement is unquestionably true. Nothing has been brought out more clearly by the recent study of Religion than the fact that when one man undertakes to cover alone any considerable subject his work is little worth. There are résumés of results, like those of Jevons and Marett, that are useful for the beginner. But it is doubtful if the beginner ought to begin with them. And these men are the first to declare that at every step they recognize the danger of giving a false impression, simply because they are ignorant of some cult or country into which the study runs; while nothing is more worthless and nothing more misleading than the attempts that used to be made by a single man to work a complete history of religion out of the books at his command. The unique value of the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS* arises from the fact that every religious idea or practice is treated separately by one who has made it his special study. This is not to say that Mr. Cook has failed. Very far from it. He has succeeded beyond all expectation; few are the students of religion who would have succeeded so well. But his success is due to the fact that he has had specialists beside him whom he could and did consult at every turn. His own knowledge is a surprise of breadth and accuracy, but it is certain that he would never have written this book if he had not been able to make it the result of 'the co-ordinated efforts of several workers.'

The importance of the study of Zeus lies not in the exaltation of his place among the gods, or in the extent to which his worship spread over the

world under one designation or another, but in the fact that in the cult of Zeus we see so clearly the movement of religious thought from the simplest natural elements to the most complex and forbidding conceptions. Zeus, whose name means 'the Bright One,' was originally conceived in zoistic fashion as the bright sky itself—a conception that has left its mark on the language and literature of ancient Greece. The change from this zoistic to the anthropomorphic Zeus was due to a 'naïve attempt to express heaven in terms of earth. The divine sky, as supreme weather-maker, was represented under the guise of an ordinary human magician or weather-ruling king. This transition, which had been accomplished well before the end of the second millennium B.C., meant that Zeus was no longer worshipped as the sky but as the sky-god.' The next step is to the mountain-top. As god of the bright or burning sky, Zeus dwelt in *aithér*, the most exalted portion of the celestial vault. And, since high mountains were supposed to rise above the lower zone of *aér* and to penetrate the upper zone of *aithér*, mountain-tops were regarded as in a peculiar sense the abode of Zeus. So the Greek, like the Jew, could sing, 'I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills.' But again, to the mind of the Greek, sun, moon, and stars were made of the same fiery stuff as the *aithér* itself. Zeus, therefore, must needs stand in relations of peculiar intimacy towards these special exhibitions of his own brightness. In short, Zeus was brought into close connexion with any and every celestial luminary. But, though this is undoubtedly the case, it must be steadily borne in mind that genuine Hellenic religion never identified Zeus with sun or moon or star. If an inscription records the cult of Zeus Helios, if a coin represents Zeus with the moon on his head, if a myth tells us Zeus transforming himself into a star, we may be reasonably sure that inscription, coin, and myth alike belong to the Hellenistic age, when—as Cicero puts it—a Greek border was woven on to the barbarian robe.

But we need not pursue the evolution further. Is it not written down in the book of *Zeus*? This volume deals only with Zeus as 'God of the Bright Sky.' And, 'I would warn my readers,' says Mr. Cook, 'that the story runs on from Volume I. to Volume II., and that the second half of it is, for the history of religion in general, the more important. Zeus god of the Bright Sky is

also Zeus god of the Dark Sky; and it is in this capacity, as lord of the drenching rain-storm, that he fertilizes his consort the earth-goddess and becomes the Father of a divine Son, whose worship with its rites of regeneration and its promise of immortality taught that men might in mystic union be identified with their god, and thus in thousands of wistful hearts throughout the Hellenic world awakened longings that could be satisfied only by the coming of the very Christ.'

JONATHAN SWIFT.

With the issue of the fifth and sixth volumes, Dr. F. Elrington Ball has brought to a close his handsome edition of *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, D.D.* (Bell; 10s. 6d. net each). Both he and his publishers deserve the thanks of every lover of Swift—and their tribe is on the increase—and of every student of English literature. No English author has ever had his correspondence more lovingly or more competently edited. Walpole's *Letters* are more voluminous, and there is a fine edition of them on our shelves. But even Walpole did not receive more thought, and he did not deserve more thought, than has been given to the perfecting of this edition of the letters of Dean Swift.

To crown his favours Dr. Ball has added to the sixth volume two Indexes, the work of Miss Constance Jacob, one of correspondents and one of topics, together running from page 250 to page 388, and without a superfluous entry. Fitzgerald wrote a *Dictionary of Madame de Sévigné* for the sole purpose of getting out of the tangle of names which occur in her letters. There are more names in Swift than in Madame de Sévigné, and they are not easy to disentangle; but there will never need to be published a Dictionary of Jonathan Swift, for these Indexes have already done all that is necessary. They form a complete and most convenient *Who's Who* to Swift's Correspondence.

The publishers, as we have said, deserve our thanks as well as the editor. Everything connected with the issue of the books, including the illustrations, is of the best and most artistic workmanship. Let us see to it that they reap some reward in a great circulation of so great a book.

ANNALS OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

A handsome book, not unworthy of the greatness of its subject, is *Annals of the Free Church of Scotland, 1843-1900*, edited by the Rev. William Ewing, D.D. (T. & T. Clark; 2 vols., 21s. net). It is not the whole history of the Free Church of Scotland—which Dr. Ewing would say goes back far beyond 1843, though it had no adjective then, and continues even until now, though it has added another adjective. Nor is it a history at all, but what it is called—*Annals*. It contains the names of all the Ministers and Congregations of the Church, and the outward facts of their ministerial life up to the year of the Union. For example—to take one that happens to turn up by chance:

KEITH-FALCONER, HON. ION GRANT
NEVILLE, M.A.

Born at Edinburgh, 1856. Son of the eighth Earl of Kintore. Studied at Trinity College, Cambridge, and Leipzig. Appointed Hebrew lecturer at Clare College, Cambridge, in 1883, Married the following year at Cannes, Gwendolen Bevan. In 1885 he offered himself to the Free Church, of which he was a communicant, as a missionary to the Mohammedans of South Africa, and by the General Assembly of the following year was recognised as a fully accredited missionary of the Free Church. Appointed, the same year, Lord Almoner Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge. In November 1886 he arrived at Aden, and before the close of the year was living in a temporary residence in Sheikh Othman. In the beginning of 1887 he had repeated seizures of remittent fever. Died on 10th May 1887. 'Very visibly he gave to the cause and kingdom of our Lord Jesus all he had. His university distinction, his oriental learning, his position in society, his means, the bright morning of his married life, his physical vigour—for he had trained body as well as mind—he brought them all to the service' (R. R.).

Publications.—*A Plea for the Tower Hamlets Mission. Kalilah and Kinnah: otherwise known as The Fables of Bidpai*. Translated from the Syriac.

Posthumous.—*Memorials of the Hon. Ion Keith-Falconer, M.A.* By the Rev. Robert Sinker, D.D., Librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge, 1888.

The second volume contains the record of the Congregation. And this time we must take as example an Edinburgh church:

ST. GEORGE'S.

Dr. Robert S. Candlish, minister of the parish of St. George's, had taken a prominent part in the Non-Intrusion controversy, and, along with many of his congregation, adhered to the Free Church in 1843. As a place of worship they rented for a time a brick building in Lothian Road. A new church, on a site nearly opposite the entrance to the West Kirk, was opened in 1845. This building was bought up in 1866 by the Caledonian Railway Company, whose station covered the site. A new church was erected in Shandwick Place, and opened in 1869. The congregation has an honourable record for enterprise and liberality in the work of church extension in the western district of the city.

Membership.—1848, 918; 1900, 1231. *Ministers*.—1. Robert Smith Candlish, D.D., 1843-1873; 2. James Oswald Dykes, D.D., 1861-1865; 3. Alexander Whyte, D.D., LL.D., 1870-; 4. Hugh Black, D.D., 1896-

ROLLAND RAINY.

The *Life of Adam Rolland Rainy, M.P.*, has been written by his Wife (Maclehose; 6s. net). There is no great choice of incident to make the biography attractive to outsiders. Nor had Mr. Rainy reached so conspicuous a place in the world as to draw to the details of his life the curiosity of the vulgar. His wife has done nothing to attract the outsider or encourage common curiosity. Better far, she has given us the opportunity of knowing and forming friendship with a singularly winning personality, a man of upright, attractive life, a true lover of the Lord.

The only exciting event is the election of 1906, when Mr. Rainy (after one defeat and five years exemplary waiting) won the Kilmarnock Burghs for the Liberal party with a majority that took everybody's breath away. The story is well told, simply, truthfully, thankfully. As there are no untouched triumphs in this world, the one regret that his mother did not live to share it, is not hidden; it makes the picture complete.

Without doubt he was great, and would have been known, had God so willed it. He did

nothing small; he hated all mean things. His growth as a speaker is visible in the book. It was very remarkable. He took no advantage. He inquired into things with care. He saw clearly, and he uttered as clearly his convictions.

Take one amusing item out of one of the speeches. He detested pretence. He disliked the making of enquiries—when the facts were known already—just to delay and do nothing. So he said: 'We have heard of an enquiry. I wonder if you ever heard of the anxious enquirer. He was a gentleman who was always anxious to find out everything. One night, after a dinner, he was going home in evening-dress, and on passing a lamp-post he noticed on the crossbar of this lamp-post that there was a placard. He could not read it from the street, and so he made up his mind at all costs that he would prosecute an enquiry as to what was on that placard. He shinned up the lamp-post, lit a match, and read the inscription, "Wet paint".'

CHURCH DEDICATIONS.

Mr. James Murray Mackinlay, M.A., F.S.A., has completed his study of *Ancient Church Dedications in Scotland*. In an earlier volume he gave an account of Churches dedicated to Scriptural Saints. The new volume deals with those dedicated to Non-Scriptural Saints (Edinburgh: David Douglas; 12s. 6d. net).

The work is done both thoroughly and completely. The saints are separated out, so far as that is humanly possible, and sufficient is told of their lives, both historical and legendary, to give the reader an interest in them; the folklore attaching to their names, or to the churches dedicated to them, is never missed—in this department of Scottish folklore Mr. Mackinlay is a recognized authority—and even the architectural features of the buildings are not forgotten. Few are the studies which demand patience and judgment as does the study of hagiology. But these qualities Mr. Mackinlay has been gifted with, or has trained himself into, beyond most of his contemporaries. The first impression that the reading of this volume makes is the sanity of its author, and that impression is deeper at the end than at the beginning.

What a fascinating study that of dedications is in the hands of a master. Any subject may be

fascinating when knowledge of it is enough to hold the mind. But this subject in Mr. Mackinlay's hands catches the interest at once.

When the editor of this journal was called to St. Cyrus, he received a letter from Professor Sayce. Professor Sayce thought he knew something of the Medes and Persians, but it was the first intimation to him that the king of the Persians had been made a saint. It is not the king of the Persians. Who *is* the saint? Let Mr. Mackinlay tell us:

'As we have seen, St. Christopher presented himself to the mediæval imagination as a giant. St. Cyric, the next Eastern saint to be referred to in connection with our Scottish dedications, was of a different type. He was a child only three years old, who was conveyed from Iconium to Tarsus in Cilicia by his widowed mother, St. Julitta, during the persecution of the Christians by the Emperor Diocletian. At Tarsus, St. Julitta was apprehended, and taken, along with her child, before Alexander, the pagan governor. She was tortured and then beheaded. Her child, following her example, called himself a Christian, and in consequence met his death by being violently thrown by Alexander down the marble steps of his judgment-seat.

'In some English dedications mother and child were commemorated together; but in Scotland the child-martyr appears to have been alone remembered. Bishop Forbes has suggested that Ceres in Fife is merely an altered form of the name of Cyric, and if so its church owed allegiance to him.

'The one undoubted dedication to the child-martyr was the church of St. Cyrus in Kincardineshire, formerly known as Ecclesgreig. It is believed to have been founded in the ninth century by King Grig, otherwise styled Grig, Girg, Greg, Gregour, and Ciric. "There is a curious notice in the Pictish Chronicle, that in his (Grig's) ninth year an eclipse of the sun took place 'die Cirici.' The day of St. Cyricus fell on the 16th of June, and there actually was a great eclipse of the sun on the 16th of June 885, which corresponds tolerably well with his ninth year. This seems to show some connection between his own name and that of the saint; and it is curious that a church in the Mearns, dedicated to St. Cyricus, is called in old charters, Ecclesgreig, or the Church of Greig." The most likely explanation is that the church of St. Cyrus was founded to commemorate

both the king and the saint. The original building probably stood in the old burying-ground near the sea, locally known as the Nether Kirkyard. We learn that on the 7th of the Ides of August 1242 "the church of Cyricus the martyr of Eglisgirg was dedicated by Bishop David de Bernham." This must have been the successor of King Girig's foundation.'

CANON WIDDICOMBE.

The Rev. John Widdicombe, after spending a long life of service for the Master, has written down his *Memories and Musings* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net) before passing to his account. He served first in certain ritualistic London churches at the time when ritualists were 'Puseyites' and had to fight (often literally) for toleration. Then he went to South Africa and held the pastorate of several parishes in the veld, became Canon of Bloemfontein, and so came home to write his memories and musings.

Canon Widdicombe must be a very old man, but his memory of events which happened forty or fifty years ago is so good that he trusts it to the least detail, even to the length of long verbatim conversations. And there is no inconsistency to condemn his faith. With an old man's privilege he goes on without much care for system, but the course of his life is quite easily followed, and the incidents and anecdotes fall in quite properly. His attitude is that of a moderate High Churchman, who has no belief in Establishment. In South Africa, he says, 'there is no State Church. There is a fair field and no favour for every denomination of Christians, and surely that is all that Christianity needs. The Anglican Church, like other Christian bodies, is, as we have seen, entirely free from the trammels of State control, and I for one thank God that such is the case.'

Canon Widdicombe tells good stories and tells them well. He tells them with circumstance—the way to make a story either a hit or a miss. Perhaps this one will suffice:

'Among the workers in Bloemfontein was one—an elderly (I must not say old) maiden lady whose name was Grimes—a lady held in honour by all. She was a gentlewoman of independent means and highly accomplished, and had given her time, talents and money to the poor of the town. She had been ordained deaconess by the

Bishop, and was in every way worthy of the office. She was a good pianist, and could make charming water-colour sketches of the scenery around, and last but not least she was the soul of humour; everyone who knew her considered her delightful.

'One Sunday evening in the midst of our repast she looked towards the Bishop and cried out in tearful tones, "My lord, I am compelled to appeal to you. I am being persecuted beyond endurance."

'I must explain that some of us at the table, myself among the number, suspected what was behind that tearful exclamation. There was a little man in the town well connected and still young, who was eccentric and almost half-witted. Indeed many people regarded him as insane, but he was not quite that. He was well meaning and quite harmless and in his poor way devout, and was a regular attendant at the cathedral. Now this simple-minded youth had unfortunately conceived a violent affection for the deaconess. In fact he was madly in love with her, although she was old enough to be his grandmother. He waylaid her whenever he could as she came out of church, and sent passionate letters to her, protesting his undying affection for her and urging her to consent to marry him. She tried in every way to avoid him, but often to no purpose. He became a terror to the dear old soul, and yet the whole thing was so ludicrous that she could not help laughing at the absurdity of it, and heartily joined in the laughter when her lady friends rallied her on the subject, since a matter of that kind could not long be hidden. I was one of those who had got to hear of it and was, of course, very sorry for the poor old lady, and would have gladly come to her rescue had it been possible, but nothing could be done. That Sunday evening matters culminated. The infatuated youth had bribed a chorister to deliver a letter to her, and the small boy had done so after evensong. Hence her appeal to the Bishop.

'His lordship heard her cry and answered, "What is the matter, Miss Grimes?"

"Oh, my lord, I repeat I am being persecuted beyond endurance."

"What is it, and how are you being persecuted?" asked the Bishop in amazement.

'Of course everyone at the table was listening.

"Well," she said, "I hardly like to mention it, but mention it I must. Just now coming out of church this letter was put into my hands. I will

read it, and then you will see how greatly I am being persecuted." And she proceeded to read aloud the effusion which the susceptible swain had sent her. I cannot, of course, remember its exact wording or the whole of it, for it was lengthy, but I will give the pith of it, together with its concluding words, which are indelibly impressed upon my memory.

"MY DEAREST MISS GRIMES, MY ANGEL,—I write these few lines to tell you once more how deeply and dearly I love you. You are ever in my thoughts. I think of you all day and dream of you all night. You know how dear you are to me, and yet you treat my affection with cold indifference and I am afraid contempt, for of late you have taken care to avoid me and have never given me the least chance of speaking to you. Hence I am compelled to write once more and implore you to have pity upon me and give me a favourable hearing. Surely the heart of so dear and loving a lady as yourself, so good to everyone, cannot be made of stone. Then why are you so hard to me?"

"Oh, *do* relent, and tell me that my love for you has conquered, and give me some faint hope that some day I may be able to call you mine.

"But if you will not listen to my prayer: if you continue to remain unmoved and refuse to give me the least spark of hope, oh! what will become of me? I shall gradually *pine away—wasted by unrequited affection, until I am reduced to the dimensions of the enclosed morsel of soap.*"

'And she displayed to our gaze the small piece of that article enclosed in the letter.

'At the time the old lady had been reading this affecting epistle in her high-pitched, tremulous voice we had with the utmost difficulty restrained ourselves from laughter, but now our laughter burst forth into one great continuous roar, in which our dear old friend joined as heartily as any at the table. Even the grave and stately Bishop was overcome and had to stuff his handkerchief in his mouth to control himself. It was excruciatingly amusing!

'I am glad to add that the young man gradually overcame his preposterous infatuation and diverted his defective brains into a more legitimate channel.'

The rationalistic account of Apostolic Christianity has been restated by Mr. Alfred W. Martin,

A.M., S.T.B., in a book entitled *The Dawn of Christianity* (Appleton; 5s. net). It is not a credible account even on the face of it. The results were bigger than these puny forces were fit to produce. But it is shattered on the rock of scholarship. Mr. Martin knows what happened at every step in the 'evolution' of Christianity, and how it happened. But when he has least hesitation he is most astray. The formation of the Canon of the New Testament he describes in a few magisterial sentences; scholars have had to write complete books about it and leave the half of the story unexplained.

But the author is honest. We see no evidence anywhere that he gives himself to the mere joy of thwarting the tradition of the Church. What he writes he writes in all sincerity as *his* account of the matter. And often it is impressive; always interesting.

Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids has contributed to 'The Quest Series' published by Messrs. Bell & Sons, a volume on *Buddhist Psychology* (2s. 6d. net). Now Mrs. Rhys Davids is a Buddhist scholar of great accomplishment, and like a true scholar she gives herself to the mastery of one department. That department is the Psychology of the Buddhists. Thus her book is to be looked upon, not as an elementary introduction to its subject—though it is clear enough to serve that purpose—but as the most authoritative work on it in English.

To Messrs. A. & C. Black's convenient and attractive series of books, 'The Social Workers Series,' edited by Mr. William Foss, a volume has been added on *Trade Unionism*, written by Mr. C. M. Lloyd (2s. 6d. net). It is now an immense subject with an enormous literature, and Mr. Lloyd has been extraordinarily successful in seizing the significance of it and making it ours, together with just the necessary detail. His book is sufficient for the student, besides being suitable for the accomplished and serious general reader. And it may be trusted. The author has not spared himself or his friends in the verification of fact; and though he has written with decision, he is not the victim of prejudice.

The Solitaries of the Sambuca, by Daniel Mauldsley (Burns & Oates; 5s. net), is a persuasive to

adopt the Catholic faith. It takes the form of a novel, but the story, though not without interest, is subordinate to the apology, and owes most of its interest to the psychological situation. The conversion of the hero—his conversion at once to God and the Roman Church—was due to a conviction of sin. There could be no better (can there be any other?) cause. But why to the Roman Church? Because 'it alone was now the only Religion which, with no uncertain voice, taught the doctrine of Eternal Punishment.'

Has philosophy ever been of any practical use? The question is raised by Mr. Henry Sturt, M.A., Private Tutor in the University of Oxford. His answer is, No. It has been of use, he says, as poetry has been of use. 'It has brought home to man the mystery and romance of his existence; it has led his mind up from low thoughts and cares into a higher and purer atmosphere. Its greatest importance has been with religion; if religion is useful, then philosophy has been useful. Popular religion is very largely a substitute for philosophy; and even in minds where the two things are kept most distinct, they must interact in no small measure. They have interacted most where they have been pursued most keenly. What would medieval theology have been without Aristotle? And what would medieval philosophy have been without the medieval Church?'

But that is not the 'use' that is meant? Is philosophy of any use in practical life? To that question Mr. Sturt answers with an unhesitating No. 'What statesman makes any appeal to political philosophy; what moral reformer makes appeal to ethics; what educator who professes to train the understanding makes appeal to logic?'

Hegel even said that Minerva's owl cannot begin its flight till the shades of evening have begun to fall.

But Mr. Sturt thinks that that owl has hooted too long. Philosophy *ought* to be useful. 'It is the duty of philosophy, I maintain, to establish theoretical principles on such matters as politics, moral conduct and education; and these principles should be valuable for the guidance of practical men.' And he has written a book on *The Principles of Understanding* to prove it (Cambridge: At the University Press; 5s. net). It is not a very large book, but in our judgment it is likely to open a new era in the teaching of philosophy. For

Mr. Sturt not only uses the language of practical men—he has indeed a wonderful gift of straightforward speech—but he actually fulfils his promise.

The new volume of 'The Great Christian Theologies,' edited by Dr. Henry W. Clark and published by Messrs. Chapman & Hall, is *Albrecht Ritschl and his School* (7s. 6d. net). The author is the Rev. Robert Mackintosh, D.D., Professor of Ethics, Christian Sociology and Apologetics, in Lancashire Independent College, and Lecturer in the University of Manchester.

In an interesting and amusing preface, Professor Mackintosh tells us the story of his hunt for rare books and rarer pamphlets containing material for his study. He has manifestly left no stone unturned (we hope he has left all his friends' heads unturned) in his determination to know the subject before he wrote upon it. Quite unintentionally the preface gives us assurance that this scholar has a keen sense of the claims of authorship, and that whatever his interpretation of Ritschlianism may be, his knowledge of it will not be found at fault. Moreover, he has written here with a clearness of vision surpassing that of any other book of his.

Professor Mackintosh's attitude to Ritschl and his school is not far from that of Dr. Garvie. He has given much study to the *School*. What has been done by Ritschlians since Ritschl—that is his chief interest and his greatest contribution. And he takes the men not only singly but also together, bringing out their influence on one another clearly and often quite strikingly. Another useful feature of his book is the way in which he traces the history of the great Ritschlian watchwords such as 'Value-Judgment,' carrying the investigation back beyond Ritschl himself as well as down from Ritschl to the present day. And as he proceeds he never loses himself in the wood, but keeps in sight the great questions of life, and at every turn directs our attention to them.

The book is more than a success. It advances our knowledge of Ritschlianism.

Part II. has now been published of *Lessons from the Old Testament*, being Notes Critical and Expository of the Passages appointed for Sundays and Holy Days, by the Rev. A. S. Hill Scott, M.A., Vicar of St. Lawrence, Seal, and the Rev. H. T. Knight, M.A., Vicar of Shortlands, Kent (Oxford University Press; 3s. 6d. net). This

second part covers the Lessons from Trinity Sunday to All Saints.

By a coincidence we have two volumes this month dealing with Church dedications, Mr. Mackinlay's on the Scottish Churches, and *Dedications and Patron Saints of English Churches*, by Mr. Francis Bond, M.A., F.G.S. (Humphrey Milford; 7s. 6d. net).

Mr. Bond's volume has a wider range than Mr. Mackinlay's. It includes the Biblical Saints (which Mr. Mackinlay treated in an earlier volume) as well as the Ecclesiastical; it contains a discussion of the whole subject of Dedication; it enumerates the saints in England who have no Dedications. And all this is only the first part of the volume. The second part deals with Ecclesiastical Symbolism, a very different subject; while the third part has something to say about Ecclesiastical Vestments, and contains an alphabetical list of the Saints with their Emblems. But the most conspicuous difference between the two volumes is found in the fact that Mr. Bond's volume contains 252 illustrations.

To get all this into a single volume Mr. Bond has had to walk circumspectly. He has not given us much biography of the saints, and less folklore. His work is more in the form of a catalogue than a history. Yet he has succeeded in making his book quite readable. We shall turn to it for facts rather than for diversion; but when we take it up to verify a date or discover a name, we are pretty sure to be found with the book in our hand some time after, caught by the interest which every fact has gained from its setting. And then the names and the dates, many as they are, have been carefully verified and may be confidently relied upon as accurate—if accuracy is ever an idea to be associated with saints and their records.

Messrs. T. & T. Clark have published a new volume of sermons by Professor Driver. Its title, taken from one of the sermons (first published in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES), is *The Ideals of the Prophets* (3s. 6d. net). The texts are all great texts, and the sermons are all great sermons. This is one of the wonders of Dr. Driver's work, that he had so complete a control of his learning as to be able to make it seem no learning at all. These sermons say the last word as exposition of their text, and in saying it reveal great principles

of prophetic inspiration, yet any child in the congregation might say, 'I understood every word.' Is it possible to make the prophets edifying while adhering truthfully to their historical time and circumstances? Every one of these sermons answers Yes.

Messrs. Cornish Brothers of Birmingham, Publishers to the University, have issued very handsomely *Huxley Memorial Lectures to the University of Birmingham*, with an introduction by Sir Oliver Lodge, D.Sc., F.R.S. (5s. net). Nine Huxley Lectures have been delivered since their inauguration in 1904, but it has been found impossible to publish more than five of them. Yet these five make a goodly sized volume, and each one of them is a real contribution to knowledge. The first is an appreciation of Huxley as a man, by Sir Michael Foster. The second explains Huxley's attitude to Natural Selection, by Professor E. B. Poulton. The other three pass from Huxley and discuss some purely scientific problem—Rationalism and Science in Relation to Social Movements, by Professor Percy Gardner; Life and Consciousness, by Professor Henri Bergson; and Pleochroic Haloes, by Professor John Joly. The last lecture is usefully illustrated

Mr. A. S. Morton's story of *Galloway and the Covenanters* (Paisley: Gardner; 7s. 6d. net) is at once a history of a great religious movement and a contribution to the local annals of an interesting neighbourhood. Perhaps Mr. Morton is more concerned with the neighbourhood than the movement. When he plunges into history he reads well; but often he passes through the stony and somewhat shallow waters of the local annalist, offering us such stones as lists of names for the bread of the imagination. Once and again, however, even amongst the names, he is arrested by a name that appeals to his own and our imagination powerfully enough to lift us out of the shallows. Such a name is that of Samuel Rutherford.

It is a book for which Galloway must be grateful. It is a book which the future historian of the Covenant and of Scotland will find indispensable.

Under the title of '*Ich Dien*,' the Rev. M. Persse Maturin, M.A., has published some 'Elementary Studies in the Life of Service' (Griffiths). There are six sermons or studies—The Inspiration of

Service, Obstacles to Service, Strength for Service, The Majesty of Service, Leading Others to Service, and Endurance in Service.

To the 'Every Age Library,' Mr. Kelly has added an edition of Mrs. Gaskell's *Mary Barton*, of George Eliot's *The Mill on the Floss*, and of Kingston's *Mark Seaworth*, together with a new edition of *The Citizen of To-morrow*, a volume of essays on Social subjects edited by the Rev. S. E. Keeble (10d. net each).

In 'The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures,' the Epistles to the *Ephesians* and *Colossians* have been done by the Rev. Joseph Rickaby, S.J., and those to *Philemon* and *Philippians* by the Rev. Alban Goodier, S.J. (Longmans). No commentary, we should think, was ever published on the Pauline Epistles with fewer notes.

A book of prayers by the Rev. G. C. Binyon, M.A., originally published under the title of *Adveniat Regnum*, is now issued in a second edition by Messrs. Longmans under the title of *Prayers for the City of God* (2s. 6d. net). The volume contains Prayers for Personal Use; Prayers before, during, and after Communion; Intercessions for a Week; the Penitential Psalms; and other minor Prayers. The Prayers are chosen mostly from modern sources, such as Westcott, Elmslie, Kingsley, Adderley, Waggett. They are brief, varied, and to the point.

The Ven. Walter Stephen Moule, M.A., Principal of C.M.S. Training College, Ningpo, and Archdeacon in Chekiang, China, has published a large octavo volume under the title of *The Offerings made like unto the Son of God* (Longmans; 6s. net). The title is intended to cover an explanation, in the light of the Sacrifice of Christ, of all the great elements of the ancient Hebrew ritual. The book has been written for edification. Archdeacon Moule is a scholar, but he makes no account of scholarship. He is a preacher and teacher of the gospel; his whole heart is there. Accordingly he has deliberately ignored all that is known by the name of Higher Criticism. He has not answered it or any of it; he has ignored it. He takes the laws of Moses as they now stand and uses them for Christian instruction and growth in grace.

Has he any right to do this? His answer is that

wherever the rites came from they have now their place in that Law, they have acquired Divine sanction, and have become part of the Divine system. They may have first belonged to Babylonian or other codes of law. But 'if we wish to understand their significance, we must study them in the place they now occupy, not in the position they held in heathen systems. The geological history of the stone in a quarry is a legitimate and interesting subject of enquiry, but it can throw little light on the place which a stone from that quarry occupies after the architect has shaped and fitted it into a building.'

But the final answer to the question is the result. If ignorance of the Higher Criticism and all its works brings out results that are good, good for the edifying of the Christian Church, that, says Mr. Moule, shows that the method also is good. And he moves unconcernedly but learnedly on to the end, making these dry bones live and propagate life beyond all conceiving.

Colonel G. A. Noyes of the Royal Artillery has published a translation of *Job* in the Hebrew rhythm (Luzac; 5s. net), the prose portions being omitted, as well as the Elihu episode. A specimen of the translation will give an idea of its success and worth. Take Job 19²³⁻²⁷:

v.²³ Oh! that my words were e'en now written down!

That they were in a book indited!

²⁴ With lead and pen of iron,
Graven on the rock for aye!

²⁵ But I know my redeemer lives;
On the dust he'll later stand;

²⁶ After this my skin's destroyed,
Rid of flesh I shall see God;

²⁷ See 'Him' for myself,
Mine eyes alone discern.

Within me my reins consume!

Sir J. G. Frazer takes a day off occasionally from the study of Religion, and edits English classics. His edition of *Cowper's Letters* in the 'Eversley' series is 'a possession for ever.' So now will be, and a dearer possession still, his selection from the *Essays of Joseph Addison* which Messrs. Macmillan have published in the same series (2 vols., 8s. net). A dearer possession; for in the *Cowper Letters* there is not the charm of the

Addison Essays, and in the editing of them there is nothing so exquisitely literary as the preface to these volumes. In that preface Sir J. G. Frazer pretends, with the delightful pretence of an Addisonian lover and in most humorous imitation of Addison's style, that he has paid a visit to Coverley Hall, has seen Sir Roger de Coverley's portrait, and has found a manuscript which tells the sad tale of Will Honeycomb's wedding.

Messrs. Macmillan have begun a re-issue of the *Dictionary of Political Economy*, edited by Sir R. H. Inglis Palgrave, F.R.S. (vol. i. A-E, 21s. net). The first edition of this volume was issued in 1901. This is scarcely a new edition, as the text does not appear to be altered. But the list of authors is brought up to date, and it is interesting to see how many of them, known in the first edition by their names and nothing else, have now attained to positions of honour and responsibility. This is excellent proof of the editor's ability. For the foremost thing, if not the first, in the editing of a dictionary is to choose the right men for the articles. That Sir R. H. Inglis Palgrave has not found it necessary to alter the arrangement of the book, or its individual articles, no doubt shows that he was equally successful throughout.

It is not a book to learn Economics from. No dictionary can be an elementary teacher. It is a work of reference. And it is one of the best works of reference that we have.

A single original suggestion is to the imaginative mind worth reams of repetition. In his book on *Economic Cycles: Their Law and Cause* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net), Professor H. L. Moore, of Columbia University, makes an original and most fertile suggestion for the study of Economics. It is well known that there is an ebb and flow in economic life, a regular alternation of energetic, buoyant activity with a spiritless, depressed, and uncertain drifting. What is the cause of this alternation of periods of activity and depression? What is its law? These are the fundamental problems of economic dynamics the solution of which is offered in this Essay. 'Economists formulated the law of diminishing returns in agriculture, and traced its all-pervasive influence in the production and distribution of the product of industry. The desideratum of economic dynamics at the present time is the discovery of a law that shall be to a

changing society what the law of diminishing returns in agriculture is to a society in a comparatively static condition. Now it is proverbial that the farmer is at the mercy of the weather. If it be true that the explanation of economic cycles is to be found in the law of supply of agricultural products, it is surely wise in a study of rhythmic, economic changes to inquire whether the law of the changing supply of raw material is not associated with a law of changing weather. Is there a well-defined law of changing weather?'

That is the question which Professor Moore has set himself for answer. Its answer demands some difficult mathematical computing and some equally difficult economical reasoning. But the student of Economics will go through it all gladly and will be rewarded.

Three essays which are as timely as they are valuable are given together in a volume entitled *Germany in the Nineteenth Century* (Manchester: At the University Press; 3s. 6d. net). The essays are on (1) 'The History of Theology,' by A. S. Peake, D.D.; (2) 'The History of Philosophy,' by Bernard Bosanquet, LL.D.; and (3) 'The History of Music,' by F. Bonavia. Thus each essay has been written by a thorough scholar in his department, and each is long enough for the writer to give us a sufficiently thorough account of its subject.

Professor Peake's work is all of the best kind—not scholarship only, but true Christian scholarship—and he has not been happier at any time than he is in this essay. He has a clear vision of the whole field; he has the skill to see the essential and the influential; he is concerned about the spelling of a name; and he can characterize a man or a movement in the fewest and most illuminating words. All that is in the man he is, and all that is here.

We notice just one thing in the essay and we do so with satisfaction. It is the justice done to Schleiermacher. It is astonishing that Schleiermacher has had so little direct influence in this country when he had so much in his own. The opinion we now hear freely expressed is that we have known too much of German theology. No, we have known too little; that is the trouble. We have known only the notorious elements in it, and these have been the worst elements. If we had known it more we should have been less hurt by

it. Few men know it in its length and breadth better than Dr. Peake, and there is no one of our time who is more truly an English theologian.

The Methodist Book Concern has re-issued a small volume of *Week-Day Prayers*, by Mr. Christian F. Reisner (35 cents), which originally appeared in 1909. This is one of the prayers:

'We thank Thee, Lord Jesus, for springtime-green, and flowers. We thank Thee for nature's cheer. We thank Thee for health, earth's sweetest boon. We thank Thee for enriching sorrows. We thank Thee for home comforts and loves. We thank Thee for crosses that lead to glory-crowns. We thank Thee for the sheaves to be reaped, if we faint not.

'Keep us worry free. Smooth our anxiety wrinkles. Teach us how to work without friction. Put the smile of heart-joy on our faces. May we do our best, and leave the rest with Thee. Gladden us with the constant consciousness of being co-workers with Thee. Fit us to be mankind's servant. Make us good so that we can be good for something in the Kingdom. Send us out to-day, O King of kings, under Thine eye and orders. Amen.'

The same publishers issue *The Heart of Prayer*, by Charles W. McCormick (25 cents net), and *Two Beautiful Prayers from the Lips of Jesus*, by William Nathan Tobie (50 cents net). The latter is a devotional study of the Lord's Prayer and the Prayer of Intercession.

Three volumes have appeared in succession written by the Rev. R. L. Ottley, D.D., Professor of Pastoral Theology in the University of Oxford. The first is called *The Rule of Life and Love*; the second, *The Rule of Faith and Hope*; and the third, which has just been published, *The Rule of Work and Worship* (Robert Scott; 5s. net). As their titles tell, they go together. They are Dr. Ottley's answer to the ancient question, What is the chief end of man? The second volume, quite recently reviewed, is an exposition of the Apostles' Creed. The third is an exposition of the Lord's Prayer. It is an exposition so successfully combining scholarship with unction that it must take its place among the few outstanding and undying expositions of the Lord's Prayer. Certainly neither student of the Gospels nor preacher of the gospel can afford to disregard it. There is nowhere to be

found (unless it has escaped our notice) a more persuasive proof of the reading, 'Deliver us from the evil one.'

Archdeacon Basil Wilberforce's latest volume of sermons appears in Mr. Elliot Stock's 'Purple' series (1s. 6d. net). The title is *Seeing God*. There are five sermons, each of which offers some form of encouragement to a 'personal recognition of Divine Love.'

A volume of *Household Prayers for Morning Family Use* has been prepared by C. S., and published by Mr. Elliot Stock (2s. net). There are prayers for every day of four weeks, and at the end a few for special occasions.

After serving the newspapers well in the silly season, dreams have become the serious study of the man of science and the philosopher. Under the title of *Dreams* (Fisher Unwin; 2s. 6d. net) there has been published a lecture by Professor Henri Bergson which he delivered before the 'Institut psychologique' on March 26, 1901, and which appeared in this excellent English translation first of all in *The Independent* of America in October 1913. Professor Bergson shows that dreams are as subject to scientific law as the path of a projectile, but their laws are as difficult to discover as those of the weather. Is there no prediction then? Certainly: when their laws are known you can predict the results as accurately as you can tell when and where a projectile will fall and what damage it will do.

A small book of *Maxims from the Writings of Mgr. Benson* has been added to the 'Angelus' series (Washbourne). The maxims are short. Here, by way of example, are three of them.

'There is no happiness in the world comparable to that of the experience known as conversion.'

'If a person's conscience tells him a certain religion is true, he's bound to follow it, whatever happens.'

'Talents are distributed unevenly, it is true: to one ten, and to another five; but each has one pound, all alike.'

As often as it is said that Ritschlianism has spent its force, a new book appears to prove that

with the Christian thinker it is the most moving system of theology in existence. It does not always move to admiration of course, but it moves. Two books on Ritschlianism are reviewed this month. One of them is entitled *Facts and Values: A Study of the Ritschlian Method*, by Guy Halliday, M.A., B.D. (Christophers; 5s. net). The scope is deliberately restricted. But it is restricted to the most important matter in the system. And the restriction gives the more scope for satisfactory treatment. Mr. Halliday knows Ritschlianism; and more than that, he knows theology and psychology. He is a considerate but penetrating critic. On the Ritschlian attitude to Mysticism, for example, he shows the good that the Ritschlians have done in insisting upon the importance of an

historical revelation. 'At the same time,' he says, 'even if Ritschl be right in his epistemology, with its confinement of knowledge to purely subjective phenomena, he is dealing in his theory solely with the conscious personality, which is by no means the whole of that personality; nor are the laws of the ordinary surface life necessarily applicable to the whole, since this includes the region of the subconscious, of which the range is unknown to us, and the laws are still unformulated. Any metaphysic can only be the rough simplification for the working purposes of life of a portion of human experience. There is still left ample room for the recognition of other experiences than those which can be reduced to a place in this working plan.'

Conflict in Prayer.

BY THE REV. EDWARD SHILLITO, M.A., HAMPSTEAD.

CONFLICT there must be to the end; in another order there will be rest, but not here; there is one glory of the terrestrial, it is the glory of battle. When the last enemy is destroyed, 'then cometh the end.' It is time to close the roll of this human story,—the age of struggle over, the age of fruition begun. The believers in war as a 'redeeming task' suggest, even to readers who hate their teaching, that they have seized a vital truth; even von Bernhardt makes many of us lay him down with the wonder in our minds—what is the truth which eludes us and baffles us in all this blasphemy? If he is wrong where is he wrong? Surely he is not wrong if he teaches that struggle has its appointed place in all created life. Surely conflict is in the spirit of the place. It is the thing *this* life is good for; what peace is given is the peace of soldiers in the trenches when there is a lull in the battle.

The apostle as he looked over the range of this earthly scene saw the Saviour going forth to subdue His enemies; one foe after another falling before Him; the last enemy was destroyed, then—the End! Life on this plane had achieved its purpose; out of the smoke and the fire of the conflict a race had been disciplined to share in the Divine Life; till then, not peace but a sword!

The quest of mankind must be not for a cessa-

tion from conflict, but *for a new field of battle*. The future depends upon the possibility of this discovery; is it or is it not possible for struggle to be transferred to the spiritual plane? Is it possible that mankind may fight, no longer upon the fields of France or Russia, but upon the plains of the inner life, and to compete in art, in science, in literature, in music, in faith. It is a long way from such a transformation. But meanwhile believers in Christ have to learn the secret of that inner conflict? They will not leave their place in the material strife; but even as they fight as good soldiers in the many phases of struggle, open to-day, they are called to explore the possibilities of conflict in prayer—they are called to wrestle, to meet God face to face, to put energy and courage and presence of mind into their life of prayer. But it appears as though this battlefield were overgrown with flowers; and there is only a dim memory of old forgotten battles.

For at least a generation Christian thought has been shy of the interpretation of prayer as a struggle. The pressure of modern science made that position hard to hold. It was hard enough to vindicate any place for prayer, and only possible, so many imagined, if the wrestling and striving were abandoned.

Though the position for thought is easier, the

effects are still felt in practice. The language of Scripture is retained; we sing the old hymns:

Wrestling, I will not let Thee go
Till I Thy name, Thy nature know;

but they sound false to many of us. When we pray, we have little that calls for such words. In prayer we have the mood of acquiescence; we know something of the rest of the soul in God; we accept in prayer His accomplished will. Outside there is enough place for strife, in the inner chamber let there be peace! It is no part of any one's duty to question the truth and the wonder of the prayer in which the soul is passive and resigned and shares

the silence of eternity

Interpreted by love;

this belongs to the treasure of the humble, which thieves cannot break through nor steal. But it must always be our wisdom to correct incomplete renderings of the Christian life by the standards of Christian experience as that is recorded for us in the history of the Church, but most of all as it is interpreted in the fulness of the New Testament. If something once familiar and fruitful has dropped out, how can we restore it? Here is a spiritual fact, partly lost,—the element of struggle is prayer. Can we discover what it means? Can we recover the secret?

Perhaps it may be urged that in the lower ranges of Christian life, stormy prayer has its place, but afterwards it is outgrown. Jacob wrestles with the angel; psalmists and prophets cry out in bitter remonstrance; they liken their inner life to a sea in which all God's billows go over them. But is not that a lower order of communion? This might be urged with more plausibility if the seal of our Lord were not set upon the struggle of the soul in communion with God. Gethsemane is a place which remains exceeding dark; but whatever else it is, it is a place of conflict. We have to do not with the experience of a Jacob wrestling by night, but of Jesus beneath the olive trees, shedding as it were drops of blood. Jesus, who prayed upon the hills of Galilee, knew what it was to spend Himself in prayer. The inner life was not for Him, and cannot be for us a land into which no alarms of war ever come. It cannot belong to the lower ranges of our spiritual being to watch and to pray with Jesus in Gethsemane.

The Christian saints in all ages have known that prayer was an energy of the soul only released and operative after conflict. Prayer was a powerful act. To-day we are fond of saying, 'Why go on with

prayer? Why not *do something?*' The charge is perfectly justified if we consider our current methods in prayer. It would be without sting, if prayer were for us the experience which the saints have known. The wrestler does something; the soldier does something; the soul in prayer must learn what is meant by these metaphors; it will be necessary in all probability to restate the truth; that will come, if only the thing itself is familiar.

There is conflict in our inner life because we are *in the kingdoms of Nature and of Grace at the same time*, and any progress towards a spiritual life must be won by strife. First comes the natural man, afterwards the spiritual man; and then only, as a wise teacher said, the truly natural man. This phase of conflict has its classical expression in the story of Jacob wrestling at Peniel. He was about to meet Esau again, and the old life was coming back upon him. A pause had come. In that pause he wrestled with a man till the breaking of the day. It was a conflict at the heart of it between his old self and the new calling—between the natural man and the prince with God. 'That he should know his adversary at first may not have been meant. It was meant that he should be troubled, wrestled with, shaken to the very deeps of his nature, flung into a vague, deep dark conflict with powers but indistinctly seen' (Davidson). The story tells how a soul is won for the kingdom of God. 'If we could but know in that dark struggle that it is the Angel of the Covenant that is wrestling with us! He provokes the struggle that He may conquer us by being overcome.' Conflict there must be if we are to rise princes with God. The entrance into our race of these kings and priests unto God marks the opening of a new chapter in the history of the world. It may be that the ages are rightly divided by our knowledge of fossil remains; but that moment which saw the first lonely wrestler, facing with a new vision the daybreak, is a more certain guide to the right divisions in the history of this planet. But always and everywhere such new beginnings follow upon struggle.

It may be doubtful whether we have taken this fact into account in our prayers; have we fought fiercely, even madly, to win our complete deliverance into the liberty of the glory of the children of God? Or are we content to have a divided life?

Again; it is only in conflict, often a desperate unending conflict, that *the new truth and vision of God come to us*.

The battle for truth is more like a siege than a battle of the old order, won between dawn and sunset. Why it should be so, we may see only dimly. That it is so, we cannot doubt. It is the familiarity of this experience in the saints, which makes the Book of Job so eternally new. There each generation sees itself struggling out of a superseded rendering of the Truth. The patience of Job is his readiness to know nothing about his peculiar mysteries, rather than dishonour God with a lie. He goes into the thick tempest a knight of the Holy Ghost—a champion of the honour of God. And he is nearly lost. Many a soul has known the conflict of prayer because it is in the transition between an incomplete view, and something else not yet given. It is the conflict by which the soul is *disentangled*. Its language then is the language of defiance and exasperation and despair; but that is more acceptable to God than acquiescence in dishonour done to Him. Disentanglement brings conflict. It is the deliberate rejection of the easy way; it brings an inward poverty for the time, and there will be loneliness and darkness in that hour. But once more conflict is in the part. It is the appointed way. 'The way is the way.' And in that inward life he who has no sword must sell his cloak to buy one, if he would come to the intimate knowledge of God.

But it is only when we consider *vicarious prayer and the agony of intercession*, that we come to our greatest lack. There is a note missing in our Christian prayers to-day. Moses cried—'Yet now if thou wilt forgive their sin—and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which Thou hast written.' The Apostle Paul said, 'For I could wish that I myself were anathema from Christ for my brethren's sake.' The one story is an anticipation of Calvary, the other is a prolongation. But wherever princes with God have prayer, they have struggled and fought for the souls of men. Prayer with them is vicarious, and it is a steady, mighty, prolonged pressure of the will and spiritual being. There may not be storm or tumult; 'the gods approve the depth and not the tumult of man's soul'; but there is in intercession as it has been understood by Christian hearts, an element for which it is only possible to borrow metaphors from warfare. In intercessory prayer at its highest there is room for all the warrior virtues—a skilful reconnoitring—a right choice of ground and time, calmness, courage, perseverance, power to strike.

A good soldier of Jesus Christ is one who knows that inner battlefield.

It is hard to tell why this should be. There might have been conceivably a race created, through whose life the life of God would have had an unimpeded way. There are faiths, especially in the East, which do interpret the world as being in all its phases an expression of the Divine, the tiger no less than the saint, the plague no less than the healing sunshine. But as it is, the Christian thinker cannot interpret life, except in the light of Christ and His work and His truth; he must believe that the purpose of the Holy God in His eternal love was to bring to Himself a race, which would respond to Him, understand Him, love Him, and enjoy Him for ever; and this response though it is His, must come through man; that Redeeming Love which is the one ultimate Power, must be *released* in mankind through man; God who is Love has always sought expression; He will only find it in this world from within the soul, and since the soul is never so much itself as in prayer, from within the soul in prayer.

There are men and women waiting for the redeeming love of God in Christ Jesus; that is the one healing power in the world; it is always seeking, always yearning, always breaking against its barriers; that redeeming love is released in the prayer of intercession. Why cannot God deal otherwise? Why should some wretched and miserable sinner wait till I pray? To put such questions is to raise the whole question of the Divine method revealed in Christ. The place of intercessory prayer is perfectly consistent with the gospel. Its difficulties are simply the difficulties of the wonderful and amazing gospel. They stand or fall together; and it is our wisdom in the spiritual world, as in all worlds, to deal with things as they are.

But if there is need for this *expression and release* of the Divine Love, why is there conflict?

Only hints can be given from that in our life which is nearest to the Divine activity in creation. There is the conflict of an artist with his medium of expression—which will always baffle him; he means so much, the instrument even when it is mastered, cannot say all that he means; art on a great scale always involves conflict—a conflict between the mind with its vision, and the instrument. We may say that in the intercession of the

soul for another, God is seeking expression, and the conflict is due in part to the inadequacy of the instrument. The thing is so wonderful, so alien to much in our human outlook, so transcendent, that its coming into a world like this through being like us means travail and strife.

In one of her sonnets Mrs. Browning speaks of the soul's expression :

This song of soul I struggle to outbear
Through portals of the sense sublime and whole,
And utter all myself into the air :
But if I did it—as the thunder-roll
Breaks its own cloud,—my flesh would perish there
Before that dread apocalypse of soul.

There must always be some such barrier between the soul and its perfect expression within the limits of this world. The interceding soul must be doomed to struggle because it is within two worlds, the one not yet known in all the fulness of its re-

sources and powers. The intercession of the soul is a divine act belonging to that other unseen and eternal order and conditioned by the limitations of our being ; that is why from our side it has the bearing of conflict, *it is conflict* ; what it looks like from God's side, we cannot tell yet ; from this side it is often like a wrestling with a reluctant God for the souls of men ; but the divine wrestler is playing for a fall, and loves to be worsted. What if all the time it is His own love struggling within us to expression and release ?

'Why pray? why not do something?' If we only prayed in Christ, if we only offered all our powers to Him, we should be doing something—we should be doing what He does for ever ; we should work in the fellowship of the Cross ; we should be not only good soldiers of Christ, but ourselves His battlefields, and the scenes of His latest victories.

Gog and Magog.

BY PROFESSOR S. H. HOOKE, M.A., VICTORIA COLLEGE, TORONTO.

At a time when the Christian Church, already prepared by the recent remarkable revival of interest in Apocalyptic studies, is being forced by the world drama of to-day to think of Armageddon and its issues, the following brief summary of the information available concerning Gog and Magog, the mysterious protagonists of the final struggle, may be of interest. The essence of Christian Apocalyptic is hope. There is always God at the end. Coventry Patmore has expressed the familiar thought finely :

Under the everchanging clouds of doubt,
When others cry,
The stars, if stars there were,
Are quenched and out ;
To him, uplooking to the hills for aid,
Appear at need displayed
Gaps in the low hung gloom,
And, bright in air,
Orion or the Bear.

I. ETYMOLOGY.

For fuller discussion of the etymology of the name 'Gog' the reader is referred to the articles on 'Gog' and 'Magog' in *H.D.B.* It will be sufficient here to sum up the available data very

briefly. The name 'Gog' has been connected with (1) *Gugu*, the cuneiform form of Gyges king of Lydia, 687–653 B.C. ; (2) *Gāgu*, ruler of the land of Sakhi, a district N. of Assyria, mentioned in the Annals of Assurbanipal. The name Magog has been explained as : (1) a contraction of *Mat-gog*, 'the land of Gog,' or *Mat-gagaia*, 'the land of Gagaia,' a people mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna tablets ; *Mat* being the Assyrian word for 'land.' (2) It has been read as *Migdon*, and connected with Har-Magedon (Cheyne). Other etymologies from Persian and Indo-European sources have been offered, but need not be discussed here.

What little evidence of an etymological nature there is seems to point towards an original geographical and etymological assignment of Gog to the peoples dwelling on the shores of the Euxine, such as the Cimmerians (Gomer), the Tabali and Mushku of the Assyrian inscriptions (Tubal and Mesech), and others. Hence in the popular imagination Gog belongs to the generic class of the Northern peoples. But by the time of the N.T. writers the term has totally lost any vague geographical sense which it may have had in Ezekiel's time. Hence the reader must be referred for a fuller discussion.

of the question to the articles mentioned above, to Driver's *Commentary on Genesis* (10²), and to Redpath's *Commentary on Ezekiel* (38¹).

II. OCCURRENCES OF THE NAME.

1. In the O.T. the references are: Gn 10², where Magog is mentioned alone among the descendants of Japheth; Ezk 38-39, in a description of the final assault against Jerusalem and the restored remnant. Possibly we should include here the remarkable LXX version of Nu 24⁷: 'There shall come forth a man from his seed, and shall bear rule over many nations, and (his) kingdom shall be higher than Gog.' It is possible that this reading may represent the true Hebrew text, as *Agag* offers no intelligible sense.

2. *Apocalyptic Literature*.—In the Jewish Apocalyptic the conception is frequently found in a general form, but there is no occurrence of a specific reference to the final enemy under the name of Gog and Magog. These names are only found in Jub 8²⁵ 9⁸ in a topographical sense, and in Sibyllines iii. 319, 512, where Gog and Magog are identified as rivers of Ethiopia. The reference may possibly be to the Nubians who returned from Egypt with Antiochus Epiphanes when he desecrated the temple. The more important passages for the general conception of the final assault are: Sib iii. 663 ff., Eth. En 56 62¹² 90¹⁶, Ass. Mos 8^{1ff}, Apoc. Bar 40¹, 2 Es 5⁶ 13^{33ff}, Ps. Sol 2²⁸⁻³⁴, Jud 16¹⁸.

3. *N.T. Literature*.—The only passage containing a specific reference to Gog and Magog is Rev 20⁷⁻¹⁰. The author of the Apocalypse represents a double assault. The first is led by the beast and the false prophet, *i.e.* the Roman Empire combined with the Antichrist, and takes place before the setting up of the millennial Messianic kingdom on earth. This attack is defeated by the Messiah in person at the head of the armies of heaven. The second attack takes place at the close of the earthly Messianic kingdom. Satan, who has been bound in the Abyss during the kingdom, is loosed, and gathers Gog and Magog, the nations in the four corners of the earth, against 'the camp of the saints,' 'the beloved City.' This attack is annihilated by fire coming down from God out of heaven. It is followed by the passing away of heaven and earth, and the final sessional judgment.

Other apocalyptic passages in the N.T. referring in general terms to the final assault are Mt 24¹⁵, Mk 13¹⁴ [Lk 21²⁰⁻²⁴ ?], 2 Th 2²⁻⁸.

4. *Rabbinical Literature*.—There are a number of specific references to Gog and Magog in Rabbinical literature. Only a few of the more important can be cited. There is the well-known passage in the Jerus. Targ. on Nu 11²⁷: 'On the last day Gog and Magog and their army will march against Jerusalem.' *Sanh.* 11: 'Gog and Magog, the future nations who will declare war against the Messiah'; 'many more years will be the war of Gog and Magog, and the remainder will be the days of the Messiah.' This latter passage is represented as being from a Persian source. The Messiah ben Joseph is to conquer Rome but to fall before Gog. A long interval elapses between the fall of Rome and the fall of Gog (*Pesik. R.* 12, 37; *Pesik.* 22, 148a; *Gen. R.* 73; *B.B.* 123b). Other passages are *B. b. berach.* 7b, *Edujoth* ii. 10, *Mechilta* 41a, 50b, 51a, *Sifre* 143a, *Sifra* 112c, *Aboda Zara* i. f. 36.

5. *Arabic Literature*.—In the Koran the Gog and Magog conception has received a large amount of mythical accretion. They are called Yajuj and Majuj, and are represented as having been shut up by Alexander the Great within a boundary wall. This wall will be broken down before the day of Judgment, and the hosts of Yajuj and Majuj will come forth to be ultimately destroyed by God.

6. *Patristic Literature*.—In the Apostolic Fathers there is no specific mention of Gog and Magog, and that cycle of Apocalyptic events, consisting in the final hostile assault and defeat, is hardly represented at all. Irenæus, who may be taken to represent the traditional point of view of the Eschatology of the Church, deals fully with Antichrist and the interpretation of his number (*Adv. Her.* v. 30), but passes over in silence the second assault after the Millennial reign. Hippolytus also, in *de Christ. et Antich.* 50, follows Irenæus in his interpretation the mystic number, but passes over Gog and Magog in silence. Possibly the Church of the Apostolic Age had come to regard the two assaults described by the author of the Apocalypse as one, namely, the pre-millennial assault led by the beast and the false prophet.

III. PLACE OF THE GOG-MAGOG CONCEPTION IN THE GENERAL SCHEME OF APOCALYPTIC.

1. *Period Theory*.—Modern investigation has made it very clear that the various Apocalyptic schemes of Babylonia, Persia, and the Jews, rest

upon a basis of world-periods. The calculation and number of these periods vary, but every scheme exhibits this feature. Every period is closed by disasters of a more or less stereotyped character.

2. *Pre-Messianic woes.*—These disasters or woes (חבלי המשיח), 'pangs of the Messiah' as they came to be called in later Judaism, fall into three main classes: (i.) An intensification of moral and physical evils. These include the ἀπόστασις of 2 Th 2³ (note the article, ἡ ἀπόστασις, i.e. *the well-known* apostasy), the waxing cold of love, Mt. 24^{11, 12}, and similar phenomena described in Dn 11³⁵, 1 Ti 4¹, 2 Ti 3¹⁻⁵. In the physical sphere occur wars, famines, pestilences, and plagues of various kinds (Mk 13⁷⁻⁸). (ii.) The assault of hostile powers against God and Messiah, against the 'navel of the earth,' against Jerusalem, against the holy city, etc. This group assumes various forms in various schemes, all ultimately to be traced back to the supreme conflict between good and evil, light and darkness. It is possible that the particular form which the tradition has assumed in later Jewish thought is due to Persian influence (see Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its non-Jewish Sources*, p. 129f.). To this group of disasters belongs the Gog-Magog conception. (iii.) The darkening of sun and moon, and the occurrence of earthquakes. This group does not fall to be discussed here.

3. *The Northern enemy.*—The Gog-Magog conception falls more precisely under the general head of the 'Northern Enemy' in Jewish eschatology. The North assumes a special Apocalyptic significance in the prophets as the source of judgment and the latter-day disasters. But in the Apostolic

Age, Gog and Magog are completely detached from any special topographical connexion and become the nations from 'the four corners of the earth.'

4. *Gog and Messiah.*—In later Rabbinical eschatology there is a considerable development of the part played by Messiah in the final act of the Apocalyptic drama. A distinction is drawn between Messiah ben Joseph and Messiah ben David, in order to satisfy exegetical requirements in the interpretation of the blessing of Ephraim (Dt 33¹⁷). The Messiah ben Joseph is slain in the great battle with Gog and Magog, while Messiah ben David slays the leader of the hosts with the breath of his mouth. No trace of this scheme of the finale appears in the Apostolic Christian literature. In Revelation the destruction of the hosts of Gog and Magog takes place through the direct intervention of God from heaven by fire.

Conclusion.—It is easy to see that the older clear-cut outlines of the scheme of the end are becoming blurred. In general the Christian writers of the Apostolic Age concentrate their attention on the mystic figure of Antichrist which is gradually undergoing spiritualization under the form of the advance of moral evil and heresy in the Church. The sense of a great final conflict is not lost, but is passing into a deeper and more spiritual form. To the writer of the Apocalypse the Gog-Magog conflict seems to represent the sense that even the old Messianic hope and kingdom cannot finally purge the earth of evil and end the age-long conflict. God alone can do it, and His intervention brings about the end of the heaven and earth, the theatre of the conflict, and ushers in the final judgment.

In the Study.

FEW books are more welcome than those which the Rev. F. W. Boreham is sending us from Hobart in Tasmania. They are the books of a minister of the gospel who never forgets his high calling, and of a master of the English tongue who cannot deny his great gift of imaginative writing. Are their contents sermons? There is a text of Scripture lurking in every chapter. If they are, we should like to know what is the effect of this

kind of preaching in the way of church attendance and the spread of the gospel. We could commend it for imitation, but, alas! how few of our preachers have trained their imagination, how few have discovered that there is an imagination to be trained!

We must quote one of the chapters of Mr. Boreham's new book, and we shall quote rather a long one. We must not suggest that all the chapters have this fulness of teaching and this

pathos, but they are all worthy of their place in the book where this is found, and of which the title is *The Golden Milestone* (Kelly; 3s. 6d. net).

The Little Palace Beautiful.

There are only four children in the wide, wide world, and each of us is the parent of at least one of them. I will tell how I made the discovery. I was going along the road that Bunyan's pilgrim travelled, and was nearing the Delectable Mountains. As Christian and Hopeful drew near those glorious hills, with their gardens and their orchards, their fountains and their vineyards, they were in such terror, because of their recent adventure with Giant Despair, that they looked aside neither to the right hand nor to the left. That is how they missed the Little Palace Beautiful. It stands among the trees of the valley just off the main road. It is a palace in miniature. Such a dainty little dwelling! Such lovely flowers in the garden! Such a ceaseless chorus of song from all the forest around! It is like a nest beautifully built among the trees. And about the garden and the home itself I saw the angels moving. They kept guard over it night and day. There are only four charming little rooms, and in those pretty rooms I found the children sleeping. And what I saw I here set down.

I.

In a sunless room that faces the south, a room whose name is Fancy, I found *the Little Child that Never Was*. And *the Little Child that Never Was* is an exquisitely beautiful child. He is the little child of all lonely men and lonely women, the child of their dreams and their fancies, the child that will never be born. He is the son of the solitary. Let me cite two instances as typical of many. The one shall be the case of a man and the other of a woman. Professor Herkless, in his *Life of Francis d'Assisi*, tells us how Francis was torn between the monastic life on the one hand and the domestic life on the other. He longed to be a monk and to dedicate himself to poverty and pilgrimage. And yet he loved a sweet and noble and gracious woman. He wrestled with his alternatives, and at length, through an agony of tears, he chose the cloak and the cowl. But still the lovely face haunted him by cloister and by shrine. And one radiant moonlight night, when the earth was wrapped in snow, the brethren of the monastery

saw him rise at dead of night. He went out into the grounds and, in the silvery moonlight, fashioned out of the snow with deft artistic fingers the images of a lovely woman and a group of fair little children. He arranged them in a circle, and sat with them, and, giving rein to his fancy, tasted for one delicious hour the ecstasies of hearth and home, the joys of life and love. Then, solemnly rising, he kissed them all a tearful and final farewell, renounced such raptures for ever, and re-entered the monastery. That night the deep impressive eyes of Francis looked full into the face of *the Little Child that Never Was*.

For the womanhood let Ada Cambridge speak. In *The Hand in the Dark and Other Verses*, she has a touching little poem that she calls 'The Virgin Martyr.' It might just as well have been called '*The Little Child that Never Was*.'

Every wild she-bird has nest and mate in the warm April weather,

But a captive woman, made for love, no mate, no nest, has she.

In the spring of young desire, young men and maids are wed together.

And the happy mothers flaunt their bliss for all the world to see.

Nature's sacramental feast for them — an empty board for me.

I, a young maid once, an old maid now, deposed, despised, forgotten—

I, like them, have thrilled with passion and have dreamed of nuptial rest,

Of the trembling life within me of my children unbegotten,

Of a breathing new-born body to my yearning bosom prest,

Of the rapture of a little soft mouth drinking at my breast.

Time, that heals so many sorrows, keeps mine ever-freshly aching.

Though my face is growing furrowed and my brown hair turning white.

Still I mourn my irremediable loss, asleep or waking;

Still I hear my son's voice calling 'Mother' in the dead of night,

And am haunted by my girl's eyes that will never see the light.

O my children that I might have had! My
children lost for ever!
O the goodly years that might have been,
now desolate and bare!
O God, what have I lacked, what have I done,
that I should never
Take my birthright like the others, take the
crown that women wear,
And possess the common heritage to which
all flesh is heir?

I said that *the Little Child that Never Was* is a very beautiful child. He is absolutely without faults or flaws or disfigurements of any kind. He is all, *all*, ALL that his father, his mother, would have him to be. And he has a great work to do in the world—that *Little Child that Never Was*. He will sweeten the life of his poor lonely father or mother or else make it as bitter as wormwood. He will wonderfully soften or cruelly harden them. *The Little Child that Never Was* calls his solitary father and lonely mother to the service of the world's childhood. It is a great thing for the world that there are men and women with no children of their own. For there are little children without fathers and without mothers, and there are little children with fathers and mothers who would be better off if they had none. And the lonely men and women are called by *the Little Child that Never Was* to devote their lives to the service of the lonely little children. And in ministering to the world's childhood they will lose their loneliness and their longing, for *the Little Child that Never Was* will become incarnate in the little children around them, and they will hear his laughter and wipe away his tears after all.

II.

In the room that faces the west and is flooded with the sunset glory, a room called Memory, I found *the Little Child that Was*. And if Ada Cambridge has described *the Little Child that Never Was*, Josephine Dodge Daskam has done so much for *the Little Child that Was*. It occurs in her poem on 'Motherhood.'

The night throbs on; oh, let me pray, dear
Lord!
Crush off his name a moment from my mouth.
To Thee my eyes would turn, but they go
back,

Back to my arm beside me where he lay—
So little, Lord, so little and so warm!
I cannot think that Thou hadst need of him!
He was so little, Lord, he cannot sing,
He cannot praise Thee; all his life had learned
Was to hold fast my kisses in the night.
Forgive me, Lord, but I am sick with grief,
And tired of tears and cold to comforting.
Thou art wise, I know, and tender, aye, and
good,
Thou hast my child, and he is safe in Thee,
And I believe—

Ah, God, my child shall go
Orphaned among the angels! All alone,
So little and alone! He knows not Thee,
He only knows his mother—give him back!

And *the Little Child that Was* is also an exquisitely beautiful child, a child that is always a child, a child that never grows up. I remember hearing a Sunday-school superintendent in England tell a story of a shepherd who could not get his flock to cross a narrow bridge that spanned a silver stream. At last he took a lamb in his arms and crossed. The mother instantly dashed across after him, and the whole flock scampered at her heels. I often think of the gentle story when I ponder on *the Little Child that Was*. And *the Little Child that Was* also has a great work to do in the world. The classical example is the story of Mrs. Josephine Butler. We all remember with a shudder the story of that holiday—the father and mother in Europe, the little girlie left at home. And at last the night came when father and mother were expected. And in the night there was the sound of wheels and the commotion in the great hall below. The excited little daughter sprang from her bed, rushed out into the corridor, jumped up on to the banister rail to peer over and see 'dadda' and 'mamma' again. And then—the lost balance! the awful fall! 'Never,' says Mrs. Butler, 'never can I lose that memory, the fall, the sudden cry, and then the silence. It was pitiful to see her, helpless in her father's arms, her little drooping head resting on his shoulder, and her beautiful golden hair all stained with blood, falling over his arm. Would to God that I had died that death for her! If only we had been permitted one look, one moment of recognition!' Here, then, is a picture from life of *the Little Child that Was!* And we all know what resulted. Mrs. Josephine

Butler could find no comfort until she rose from her grief and devoted herself to all the wayward and motherless daughters of the great world outside, and everybody who knows the story of that greatly heroic life for the world's womanhood thanks God for that *Little Child that Was*. *The Little Child that Was* calls, not for sorrow, but for service.

III.

In a room called Experience, a room that faces the north and gets all the sun, I found *the Little Child that Is*. What a wonder he is, to be sure! I am not surprised that people have asked, 'What are little boys made of?' Nor am I surprised at the divergence which has characterized the replies. But boys and girls are made neither of sugar and spice nor of snips and snails. *The Little Child that Is* is made of Curiosity, Ambition, and Imagination. And these are all fine things. Curiosity, rightly developed, has led all our explorers across uncharted seas and untrodden continents, and has lured our scientists and inventors to their triumphs and their fame. But it needs educating. It is no good telling a child that he must not go to the cupboard. You only inflame his desire to go. You must satisfy him in some way, either that there is nothing in the cupboard that he needs, or that there is good reason why he should be forbidden from approaching it. The universe is full of wonderful and tantalizing cupboards. And half the damage done to fair young lives is caused through our insane way of telling them on no account to look into a certain cupboard. 'Don't look at the cupboard!' 'Don't think of the cupboard!' 'Don't read of the cupboard!' we cry, until we have so roused their innate curiosity that the forbidden cupboard becomes the one topic of their thought and speculation. The high art of training young people, all of whom are in the continental and most romantic stage of discovery, lies in the adoption of some sane and reasonable and satisfying attitude towards the world's wonderful cupboards.

The same is true of Ambition and Imagination. *The Little Child that Is* dearly loves to excel. He wants to win. And the wise parent will not seek to crush his pride of achievement, but to educate it. We must point him out the heights that are best worth climbing, the goals that are best worth reaching, the prizes that are best worth winning. And the culture of the Imagination, too, is surely

well worth while. *The Little Child that Is* has an amazing creative faculty. He peoples every crack and crevice in the solar system with fairies and elves, hobgoblins and ghouls. It is the sense of the Infinite stirring within him. If only we could preserve it to him! What a world this would be if we had a touch of imagination left in it! Our churches are languishing for it. One flash of real imagination would save us from that detachment from reality which is the secret of half our failure. The imaginative faculties of *the Little Child that Is* would enable us preachers to project ourselves into the real lives of our people and to say the things that would really help them. And the world needs it, too. 'I understand now,' says Mr. H. G. Wells, 'why modern electioneering is more than half of it denunciation. There is nothing constructive. That calls for the creative imagination, and few are able to respond to that call.'

Here, then, is your *Little Child that Is*! He is made up of these three priceless ingredients—Curiosity, Ambition, and Imagination. Crush his curiosity, and you will find him sinister, self-satisfied, knowing all he cares to know. Crush his ambition, and you will find him, hands in pockets, at the street corner. Crush his imagination, and you rob him of his power to lead this old world into new joys and new experiences. The father and mother to whom *the Little Child that Is* has come have already tasted of the bliss of heaven; but a fearful responsibility attends their rapture.

IV.

And in a room whose window faces the east, the sunrise, a room called Hope, I found *the Little Child that Is to Be*. A wonderful, wonderful child is he—*the Little Child that Is to Be*. I often feel that I should like to take every young fellow in my congregation into this room that faces the sunrise and show him this sweet and slumbering angel-face. And as he looks down upon the head on the pillow I would say, 'Take care, when you are making love to the girl of your fancy, that you are securing for *the Little Child that Is to Be* a mother capable of maintaining the great and holy traditions of motherhood. Take care that you are winning to yourself a woman whom you can set with pride and confidence before the eye of *the Little Child that Is to Be*, as the embodiment of all that is pure and noble and unselfish and true! And I often feel

that I should like to take every girl in my congregation into this little room with the eastern window. And, as she gazed tenderly down into the sleeping face of *the Little Child that Is to Be*, I would say to her, 'Take care, when you ally yourself with the lover of your fancy, that you are securing for *the Little Child that Is to Be* a father to whom you may always point with proud motherly affection! Take care that you are setting before the eyes of *the Little Child that Is to Be*, when he wakes up, a father whose character he may copy and in whose safe footprints he may plant his own! Take care! Take care!' And I would have both young men and maidens, as they stand beside this sleeping angel, to remember that whenever they yield to temptation they are striking a more terrible blow at *the Little Child that Is to Be* than they will ever be able to strike him with clenched fist. And whenever they resist and overcome temptation they are securing for *the Little Child that Is to Be* a finer heritage than any they will ever leave him in their wills. 'Take care, take care,' I would say to to every man and maiden, 'take the greatest, tenderest care of *the Little Child that Is to Be*!'

V.

I said when I began that there are only four children in the wide, wide world, and that every one of us is the parent of at least one of them. That is so. Every man and woman on the face of the globe has a child of his own—one or other of these four. And a little child is always a leader. 'A little child shall lead them.' And be sure *the Little Child that Never Was, the Little Child that Was, the Little Child that Is, and the Little Child that Is to Be* have come stealing into all our hearts and all our homes that they may lead us, their dusty, world-stained fathers and mothers, out of our sins and out of ourselves to the dear feet of that Holy Saviour in whose radiant and gracious presence the little children always felt at home.

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

Easter—1915.

'He is not here, but is risen.'—Lk 24⁶.

My boys and girls, this is Easter morning—Easter morning, 1915.

You know that with people who love the name

of the Lord Jesus Christ, Easter is counted a time for rejoicing. I believe that amongst your grown-up friends here, there are many who came into church with very thankful hearts indeed. Coming along, they felt so glad that they wanted to say to some of the other church-going people, 'Don't you love Easter Sunday? I think it is the next best day to Christmas.' Ministers have often said things like that to you. But I believe that even while they were saying them, they felt that it was impossible for boys and girls really to understand the joy of the Resurrection. To your fathers and mothers, it means a story of joy coming after great sorrow—of life coming after death. Not one of us likes to speak to boys and girls about death, and that simply because we want you to think about life. But on this Easter morning of 1915, we cannot help asking ourselves, 'Why should it be so?'

To-day, we are feeling happy, because Christians have rejoiced in Christ's resurrection for hundreds of years. We all know that He died upon the cross, but—did you ever think what His death must have meant to His disciples? They had been so happy during the three years they had been in their Master's company. They wished for no happier heaven than to be beside Him. There was something of pride in their happiness too, for, had not Jesus the power to work wonderful miracles—even to raise the dead to life? How dark, then, must that day have seemed to them when He was crucified, and they heard the mocking tone of those who said, 'Ah! He saved others, but he could not save himself.' And—we have read the story so often—I do not think it is possible for you boys and girls, or any of us, to think ourselves back to that burst of sudden happiness that came to the two Marys—they were weeping—when they saw the angels at the tomb, and heard what they said.

A good many years ago, I read in the newspapers of a terrible mining disaster. It happened in Fifeshire. Day after day, there appeared news of numbers of men having been rescued. But after nearly a week had passed, sorrowful women and children sat from early morning to late at night at the pithead, hoping and hoping for a sight of those who had gone down one day, and had never come back. At last, when nearly all hope had fled, and despair had settled on the waiting company, the rescuers appeared. They

had two miners with them; but so faint that they could not walk, they had to be supported. I do not remember what was said about their wives and children, or if they had any. But a very strange feeling came over me when I read how those sad and weary women wept for joy, as they went forward and kissed the dear grimy faces.

In a way, nothing could be farther apart from Christ's resurrection. *It* was all beautiful. His sepulchre was hewn out of the rock, and no one had ever been laid in it. Loving hands had dressed Him in beautifully white linen, and the two Marys were met by men in shining garments. But I think their joy was akin to the joy of the humble women in the mining village—it was a wonderful joy full of thankfulness which they could not express.

As I said, it is often felt that the joy of Easter has in it something beyond the understanding of boys and girls. This year, however, our hearts are in a manner relieved. We can talk to you about Easter, as we have never talked before. Do you wonder how this is so? For months and months many grown-up people have been preaching Easter sermons to themselves—Easter sermons, too, that are full of a great and deep joy, and that you could understand. In your homes you have heard your fathers and mothers talking very sorrowfully. You could not help thinking about death as they talked, for you knew that your big brothers and many of your friends were facing it. To many boys and girls—to some, I believe, in this church—the experiences of these past months have been like following their fathers and mothers through the Valley of the Shadow of Death. One mother I know is very timid—she keeps fearing that the worst will happen, and that makes her little girls frightened too.

But— isn't it sometimes a blessing to be able to use that little word?—the resurrection of Jesus Christ has made this life just a story of dying and living again.

A very brave mother said to me the other day, 'My boy has gone, and now I can ask God's blessing upon him, for I was unhappy till he went.' Her mind was on the Resurrection. In days like these, some people can be glad even in the presence of Death; out of all this sorrow and darkness they look for a new and better nation. My boys and girls, there is no reason why that

new nation should not be pure as the men in white garments. It was needful that even you should know sorrow, for we were all forgetting about God.

A new and risen kingdom of Great Britain! You are to be the men and women of it. To you will fall the duty of upholding its honour. We know that you are not afraid of death in battle for the right; your brothers have shown us that. And they are leaving with you something to remember—and keep. We call it a heritage. Will each of you resolve that in your thoughts and your words you will never prove unworthy of it? If you—if all the children in Scotland, and England, and Ireland do this, the new and risen Great Britain will shine with a light that will throw its beams into every corner of the world. From Christ who died and rose again we get the light that is helping us through our present sorrow.

Will you pray to God to help you to play your part?

II.

The Rev. C. E. Stone, the author of *The Angel in the Corner*, has issued another volume of 'Talks to Children,' to which he has given the name of *Flowers of Gold* (Robert Scott; 2s. net). Here is a fair example of the Talks, both for length and for quality:

Prickles.

Micah 7⁴.

'The best of them is as a briar,' says Micah. What does he mean? You go and buy perhaps a pound or two of nuts. When you examine them you find some have only dust inside and some are withered and dried. They are a poor lot, and so you say, 'The best of them are only like peas.' And Micah thought the people were a poor lot. Why, he said, the very best of them are only like briars with a little blossom and plenty of thorns. I am afraid it is true of us all. The best men and women I know are 'briars' sometimes, and so are the best boys and girls.

When are best people briars? When they are tired. A man who has been at work all day and comes home overtired is apt to be prickly. So are you. There was the long morning at school, then games, then school again, then lessons at home, and as a result you were so tired that you were

cross, and nobody could speak to you without getting a sharp answer. When you feel like that, tell people so, and ask them not to bother you. Better still, go to bed and sleep it off. Jesus was often tired, but He was never cross. Why should you be?

When are the best people briars? When they are disappointed. Father expected a cheque or a big order, and as it did not come, he went home cross. Mother thought she was going to have that new dress, but was not able to get it, and it upset her. You did not get many presents on your birthday, could not go for that outing, had to stop in because of the rain, and as a result you were 'prickly.' How silly it is! Jesus, tired and hungry, came to a village where He expected to spend the night, but they would not let Him. The disciples were cross, but He was not. He expected people to love Him and believe in Him, but they sneered at and hated Him. Yet He was not cross. He was often disappointed, but never irritable and prickly. Next time you feel that way, go to Him and say, Help me to bear disappointment as You did.

When are the best people briary? When they cannot get their own way. If the minister cannot have his way, he is inclined to be nasty; so is the deacon. If the husband or the wife cannot have all their own way they sometimes quarrel. And if you cannot go to the pictures, cannot have those friends in to tea, cannot have that pocket-money, what trouble there is with you. You are as prickly as a porcupine with all his quills standing up.

Now suppose you could have all your own way, and people never opposed you and let you do as you liked and have what you wanted. That would be jolly. Would it? You would become a spoilt child, a nuisance to everybody, and of no use in the world. And that is why God won't let me, nor father, nor mother, have all our own way; and that is why He will not let you have all yours; because He is determined you shall not be spoilt. Next time you are inclined to be prickly, remember that, and it will help you to be content. Jesus did not have all His own way; but it did not make Him cross. He said: 'Thy will, not mine, be done.' And all must try and learn that lesson. If we do, we shall become roses, instead of briars.

III.

How to be a hero.

'We were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight.'—Nu 13³³.

'The Lord is with us: fear them not.'—Nu 14⁹.

When the Children of Israel were on the borders of the Promised Land, Moses sent forward twelve spies—one from each tribe—to find out all about the land. These men received orders to explore the country, and discover whether the soil was fertile or not, what sort of crops grew there, and whether it was well wooded or not. They were also to find out about the inhabitants—whether they were strong or weak, good or bad, and whether they lived in camps or in strongholds. Lastly, they were to bring back samples of the fruit of the land.

When the men returned after forty days, they were divided into two distinct groups. All of them were agreed that for the most part the land was very fruitful, and to prove it they brought back a bunch of grapes, so large and heavy that it had to be carried on a staff between two men. But only so far did their opinions agree. When they came to tell of the inhabitants of the land and of their cities, the spies were divided.

The first group was much the larger, and consisted of ten men. These men had allowed their fears to get the better of them. 'The country,' said they, 'is overrun with wild and warlike tribes, the cities are surrounded with walls—very high and very strong,—and we saw enormous giants there—so big that we felt like grasshoppers in their sight.'

The second group contained only two men, Caleb and Joshua. These two looked at things in a different light, because they remembered what the other men forgot—or chose to forget—that God was with them, and would not forsake them, for He had promised them the land, and willed that they should now go up and possess it. 'Let us go up at once,' said Caleb, 'for we are well able to overcome it.' Then they both reminded the Israelites of God's protecting presence. 'The Lord is with us,' they said: 'fear them not.'

How different are the reports of these two sets of men. The frenzied exaggerations of the ten spies, and the calm, clear, courageous words of Caleb and Joshua. Yet the Israelites listened to the ten cowards instead of to the two brave men.

They wept, and wailed; and murmured against God. They even suggested returning to Egypt, and all the thanks Caleb and Joshua received for their brave stand was a volley of stones.

So God decreed that none of these foolish Israelites should ever enter the Promised Land. They had made their choice. They might have gone on into that rich and fertile country and enjoyed its plenty, but, rather than face a few dangers,—dangers through which God had promised to bring them,—they preferred to stay in the barren wilderness, or return to the persecutions of Egypt. God punished them by ordaining that they should wander in the Wilderness for forty years, that they should die there, and that only their children should enter the Land of Promise. Caleb and Joshua alone were allowed to reach it.

We have all to meet dangers and difficulties in this life, and the way we meet them determines what sort of men and women we are. There are just two kinds of people in the world—those who face up to their difficulties, and those who turn their backs on them and run away. The first are in the ranks of the brave men, the last in the ranks of the cowards. The first often suffer hardship and peril, but from amongst them come the heroes of the world; the last have an easier time, but they never do anything worth doing in the world. To which side would you prefer to belong?

Before we go further I want you to understand clearly what is really meant by the word 'coward,' because it is a word that is very often misused. Remember it doesn't mean you are a coward if you are afraid of things. It is not the people who see no danger that are the bravest, but the people who fully realize the danger, and yet face it all the time. Some people are born brave; they have little imagination, and it is no effort to them to keep cool. Others are possessed of very vivid imaginations, and see the dangers as they are, and often very much worse than they are. Somehow, I have an idea that Joshua belonged to this class; and the reason why I think so is, that when, later on, Joshua was about to lead the Children of Israel into the Holy Land, he was told repeatedly, first by Moses and then by God, to 'be strong and of a good courage.' It seemed as if he needed a lot of cheering and encouraging. Yet Joshua never turned aside from the right path. His was a very difficult task, but whatever his fears

may have been he marched straight on, and led the Children of Israel safely into the Land of Promise.

I want to speak first of our *Imaginary Difficulties*.

The reason why I am putting them first is because I know they are very real to children, and often much worse to face than the real difficulties. I wonder how many of you are afraid to go into a dark room, or to sleep in one. Some boys and girls are very much afraid of this. Fear makes them picture all sorts of terrors. Yet there is nothing in the room at night that was not there in the daytime, and God is just as truly with you as He was when the sun shone. The wrong way to overcome this difficulty is to give way to your fears, and not venture into the room. The right way is to go in bravely in spite of your fears. By degrees you will become less and less frightened, and all the time you will be growing into a hero.

Have you ever seen a horse shying at a bit of white paper on the roadside? The wise and kind rider leads his horse up to the paper so that he may have a good look at it and see that there is no harm in it. That is how we must treat our imaginary difficulties.

Now for the *Real Difficulties*. First among them I shall put our *Tasks*.

That word includes a great deal—it includes our lessons, our duties, and, later on, our daily work, or our business. Sometimes our lessons are a terrible worry. They are difficult to understand, and we would much rather be out playing with other boys and girls. Or perhaps it is a difficult piece of music that taxes our patience, and we feel inclined to throw it aside and take something easier. Well, you can do so if you like—and be a coward. Remember it is only by strenuous effort and hard work you can become brave or great men and women.

Have you ever passed through the station at Newcastle? Next time you do, be sure to look out of the window and you will see a curious thing on the platform—a thing that you think must have got into that place by mistake. What is it? Just a funny, old, ramshackle-looking engine. Yet that engine is a monument to a man of whom Newcastle is justly proud—George Stephenson, who invented the first railway engine. That boy won

his way by sheer pluck and perseverance. He never allowed any difficulty to get the better of him. He began life as a little herd-boy at twopence a day, and step by step he won his way up. He was nineteen before he learned his ABC, because education was not free in those days, and it was not till then he was able to pay the school fee of threepence a week out of his wages. When he brought out his invention, he was met by a storm of opposition. Who ever had heard of such an absurd thing? Every one would be killed who risked their lives in a railway train! Yet George Stephenson held on in spite of much opposition, and in the end he got his way. Where should we have been to-day if George Stephenson had given in?

It doesn't seem a very noble thing, just to stick in, and learn a difficult lesson, but it is all the more noble because there is no glory about it—no blare of trumpets or beating of drums. Perhaps nobody will know how hard you have striven; nevertheless you are laying the foundations of a hero, and, who knows, perhaps some day you will take your place among the great ones of the earth.

When Nelson was a boy he once lost heart and very nearly gave in. He had been at sea some time, had gone through many hardships and dangers and had not yet won the rank of a midshipman. Then his health broke down and he was just on the verge of throwing the whole thing up, thinking he would never reach the top of the tree, when suddenly a great thought came to him. His life was not his own. He had a King and a country to serve. For England's sake he would brave every danger, suffer every hardship, overcome every difficulty. From that day he never turned back, and no boy needs to be told what England owes to Nelson.

We all owe a duty to our country. We owe it to do our best in the task appointed to us. Are we going to turn back from it just because it seems humdrum, and tiresome, and not to our taste? The Israelites turned back. They were afraid of the difficulties and the dangers; they forgot that they owed it as a duty to their God, and to their nation, to go forward at that time. And what was the result? Forty barren years of wandering in the desert; the glory which might have been theirs passed on to other men!

But there is another difficulty we have to meet—the difficulty of *Standing up for the Right*.

To stand up for the right? That is what the brave Belgians did. The Germans asked that they might be allowed to walk through Belgium, and in that event none of the inhabitants should be harmed. That would have been the easy way for the Belgians, but did they agree? Rather than sell their honour, rather than go back on their plighted word, they risked their lives, their homes, their dear ones, their beautiful cities!

That is what hundreds of martyrs did when they gave their lives rather than deny their faith.

And that is what boys and girls are called upon to do to-day. Nobody wants you to be prigs, but there are occasions when you have to stand up for the right whatever the consequences may be. It isn't an easy thing. It often means risking one's popularity, but it is the only honourable course. Perhaps it is a case of taking the part of a weaker comrade who is being bullied and laughed at. The Israelites were splendid bullies; they were also splendid cowards. They found it much easier to stone two helpless men than to go and fight the sons of Anak. Perhaps it is just speaking out bravely when something is being done which doesn't meet with your approval, and when your silence means that you approve of and share in it.

Have you heard of Bishop Patteson, the brave missionary to the South Sea Islands, who was killed by the natives? He was a brave, strong man, not afraid to lay down his life, and he grew out of a brave, strong boy.

When he was at school he was captain of his cricket team, and one of the best players in it. One day, after a match, the boys began to make silly jokes, and use bad words. Patteson stood it till he could stand it no longer. Then he rose and said, 'Look here, I'll not share in this kind of talk, and I'll not listen to it. If it goes on, I must leave the room, and resign from the team.' And he did leave the room, and he did resign from the team. It must have cost him a lot, but it cost the other boys a lot too. Patteson was their best player, and you may imagine what it was like to lose him from the team. They gathered round him, and begged him to come back, and promised never again to annoy him with their bad stories. They kept their promise, and Patteson went back, and led the team to victory.

Stick up for the right then, even if you are in the minority. Don't go with the majority if they are wrong.

In the last place, I want you to think what was the difference between the ten spies and the two. What made them act so differently? Was it their upbringing? No; they had all lived the same life of hardship in Egypt. Was it their position? No; they were all 'heads of the Children of Israel,' each man a 'head' in his own tribe. What was it then? Just this: The ten were measuring *themselves* against the giants, but Caleb and Joshua were measuring *God* against the giants.

That is the secret of true victory—the secret of how to be brave. David knew it when he went against Goliath, Gideon knew it when he went forth against the hosts of Midian with his three hundred. The disciples knew it when they set out to conquer the world for Christ.

And we can know it too. Have you heard the story of Stonewall Jackson at the battle of Bull

Run? The fight was waging very fierce, shells were exploding and bullets flying in all directions. Jackson had been hit in the head; yet still he remained perfectly cool, and apparently indifferent to danger. Another General asked him the reason, and received the reply: 'General, my religious belief teaches me to feel as safe in battle as in bed. God has fixed the time for my death. I do not concern myself about that, but to be always ready, no matter when it may overtake me.' After a pause he added: 'General, that is the way all men should live, and then all men would be equally brave.'

Whatever be our difficulties, whatever be our dangers, we need never fear them if we can say with Caleb and Joshua—'The Lord is with us.' 'Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us.'

In Praise of Faith.

A STUDY OF HEBREWS XI. 1, 6, XII. 1, 2.

BY THE REV. A. E. GARVIE, D.D., PRINCIPAL OF NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

III.

FAITH is a venture; but it is not *a forlorn hope*. It has value, for by it man gains his highest good. Faith has had, and ever has, its verification in religious history and experience. The Christian faith, to which the writer turns in the twelfth chapter, has the verification that the record of the faith of the heroes of faith under the old covenant offers, for 'we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses.' It can find its final and absolute verification in Christ, 'looking unto Jesus the author and the perfecter of faith.' Each man can get a verification of it himself in his Christian character and experience, if by it he is enabled to 'lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset *him*, and run with patience the race that is set before *him*' (He 12¹⁻²). Each of these modes of verification demands our closer scrutiny.

(1) About the cloud of witnesses a twofold assertion is made. In the last verses of the preceding chapter it is asserted that not having found full satisfaction for themselves they await

with hope the fulfilment of God's promise in the Christian community. Their good can be completed only by the consummation being wrought out in Christian character and experience. As they apart from us cannot be made perfect, we, in our Christian faith, and what it secures and accomplishes, can minister to their comfort, peace, and joy. In the first verse of this chapter they are represented as by their presence with us, and interest in us, encouraging us in the effort which the Christian life involves, and assuring us that it is not made in vain. How significant and valuable for us who have loved ones in the Unseen both thoughts are!

(i.) They who have lived and loved, suffered and laboured, here on earth for the kingdom of God do not at death snap the thread of continuity between this life and the next. Delivered from sin, sorrow, death, and judgment, they have not yet entered into full possession of their heavenly inheritance, for heaven's completion waits for the fulfilment of God's purpose on earth. It is a

comfort and help for the bereaved to think that their loved ones are waiting hopefully for that glorious and blessed consummation for which they are working in hope. Without attempting to formulate any doctrine of an intermediate state preparatory for the final perfection, glory, and blessedness, we may welcome such a suggestion as the writer here offers as harmonizing the individual and the universal hope, which is rooted in, and springs out of the Christian faith. There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth; heaven's joy increases as the kingdom of God spreads and grows on earth.

(ii.) The Christian believer is not in a succession of heroes of faith; he belongs to a company that not only lives eternally in God, but is near to him, and cares for him. They who were actors are now represented as spectators. That is all that the writer's purpose requires him here to state for our comfort and encouragement; but may we not venture a step further than he has done, and suggest that they are not idle spectators, but that in ways too secret for us to detect they are helpers of our faith? Can they whose joy it was to minister to our good, while here on earth, be denied the further joy of continuing that ministry? If apart from us they are not perfected, are we being perfected apart from them? Is not their partnership with us in this life not less, but more real, even in the life beyond? The Church Militant and the Church Triumphant are and cannot but be one.

(2) I have taken for granted that we need not limit the cloud of witnesses to those heroes of faith immediately present to the thought of the writer. Not only the patriarchs, lawgivers, rulers, and prophets under the Old Covenant may be included in this company; but the apostles, the fathers, the saints, the sages, the seers, the martyrs, the reformers of the Christian Church: and not only they whose names are written large in the annals of the Church; but also those whose names are graven on the tablets of our hearts, who, known to and prized by only a few, yet not less faithfully lived, laboured, suffered, and 'fell on sleep' in Christ. When we contemplate these believers of all lands and ages, in their experience and character, their labours and sufferings, sacrifices and services, what a verification of the venture of faith is ours! They all lived and endured as seeing Him who is invisible, as tasting of the powers of the age to come. God and immortality in Christ were their

inspiration. They were not dominated by the material, but ruled by the spiritual: they were not engrossed in the present, but were possessed by the future. They were what they were, and did what they did, because the invisible to them was real, and the future certain. Their example should convince us that faith is 'worth while,' that life at its truest and best is possible only as its supreme interest lies beyond earth and time in the Unseen and the Eternal. It is good for us to realize, so far as it is possible for us, 'here in the body pent, absent from home,' the presence of that cloud of witnesses. Without the sensible tokens on which our intercourse on earth depends, may we not believe that there is a reality of the communion of saints; and there may come to us the *uplift* of belonging to such a society?

(3) And yet the writer would not have us fix our attention on them to catch, if we may, some glimpses of their glory, or overhear some snatches of their song. No, it is to Jesus that we are to look, and to Jesus in one particular aspect of His manifold perfection. We are to look to Jesus as *the author and perfecter of faith* (the word *our* inserted by A.V. and R.V. alike hides the true meaning). He is here presented not as the object but as the subject of faith; and we are called here not to believe in Him, but to believe as He did. He is, that goes without saying, the object of Christian faith as Saviour and Lord, for He alone mediates for us the truth and grace of God, and this epistle so presents Him. But what is relevant to the context is the complementary truth that He is the subject of faith. A distinction used to be made between the religion of Jesus and the Christian faith; and defenders of the truth of the latter have often failed to recognize the worth of the former. Jesus mediated the divine truth and grace in His personal relation to God, His dependence on communion with and submission to the Father; in short, through His faith. He received in faith from God what He imparted in grace and truth to men. It was by the exercise of faith that He so anticipated the joy which was set before them, that He was enabled to endure the Cross, despising shame. This enthronement is the victory of faith in God over sin, death, and judgment. He could not be our Saviour and Lord, the object of our faith, had He not as the Son lived by faith in God as His Father. Accordingly, Christ is the supreme example of faith. In Him and Him alone we can

see to what depths faith can reach without failing, and to what heights it can mount without growing faint; what sacrifices it can endure, and what victories it can secure.

(4) Jesus is, however, more than an example: as we look to Him, He surely looks on us, and His look is potent as was His look on Peter. He is not an example of the distant past, but a companion of the immediate present, and a companion endowed with immeasurable transforming influence. 'We all, with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit' (2 Co 3¹⁸). That He as Spirit can become an inward renewing power is the testimony of Christian experience, and the extent of that influence our thought cannot measure. But, meanwhile, we may limit ourselves to considering the influence of Christ as psychologically explicable. Concentration of the attention on, absorption of the interest in, an object has a reflex influence on the personality in reproducing the characteristics of that object. We become good or bad as we fix our minds on good or bad sights, sounds, persons. Accordingly, the contemplation of Christ will, apart altogether from the conscious, voluntary activity He may put forth on our behalf, produce resemblance to Christ. The aspect of His manifold perfection on which we fix our gaze will be the aspect which will be reproduced in us. If we contemplate His faith in temptation, trial, sorrow, suffering, and death, our faith will develop, and in this respect we shall be like Him. For this reason a knowledge of the earthly life of Jesus, if joined to an insight into its inner meaning, may be made a very constant and potent means of grace. As we companion with Him in the Wilderness of Temptation, the Mount of Transfiguration, the Garden of Agony, and the Cross of Desolation, we shall be enabled to live through all experiences as He did by faith in God.

(5) With the inspiration of the cloud of witnesses and of Jesus Himself, we may put our faith to the test and find the verification of our venture.

(i.) 'The race that is set before us' is the vocation in life which has come from God to us; it is the assigned task. In accordance with the whole context we may affirm that this vocation will possess two characteristics, which may be expressed in the language of the preceding chapter. We shall look for 'the city which hath the foundations,

whose builder and maker is God.' It is a spiritual and not a material good which will be sought. Again, we shall desire 'a better country, that is an heavenly.' The spiritual is also a future good. Paul has the same thought. 'We look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal' (2 Co 4¹⁸). It is truth, love, holiness, blessedness, the Christlike (which is also the Godlike, for He is the image of the invisible God) that is sought. The vocation has the marks of faith, for here the invisible rules as the real, and the future as the certain.

(ii.) There are two hindrances to the fulfilment of the vocation, and consistently with his figure of the vocation as a race to be run, the writer describes these hindrances as a burden, and a clinging garment (this is the figure suggested by *ἐπιβρίστατον*, no less than by *ἀποθέμενοι*). In the burden are included even the innocent things, the pleasures and the profits of this earthly life which divide the affections, and distract the efforts, and so prevent the concentration of interest and purpose which the spiritual, future good demands, if it is to be constantly pursued, and finally secured. Faith which prefers the higher good will make possible all the self-denial in respect of any lower goods which may be needful. Had the rich young ruler had faith enough in the eternal life about which he questioned Jesus, he would have sold all he had, and given to the poor, that he might follow Him.

(iii.) The clinging garment impeding the racer's steps is sin. 'The article *τῇ* does not point to some particular sin, but to that which characterizes all sin, the tenacity with which it clings to a man' (*The Expositor's Greek Testament*, iv. p. 365). Faith gives deliverance from sin, for it brings another interest, affection, purpose into the life. It is our interest that directs our attention, and our attention that determines our action. 'And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat' (Gn 3⁶). Thought dwells on the object until the will is moved. The faith for which the invisible is real, and the future certain, will not allow the soul to be attracted to and dominated by the sensuous, temporal good that sin offers. Persistent as temptation may be, yet the constancy of faith can

prevail against it. What faith possesses in Christ so attracts and dominates the soul as to exclude all other interests. The writer represents the laying aside of the burden and the clinging robe as preparatory to the race as a task to be undertaken; but here both his imagery and his psychology are defective. It is the faith which is the characteristic feature of the Christian vocation that delivers the soul both from the burden and the clinging garment, by the process, just sketched, of the mutual exclusiveness of rival and competing interests. When heaven reigns, earth resigns its sway; when grace rules, sin ceases to be.

(iv.) The word 'patience' does not at all adequately express *ὑπομονή*. It means endurance, steadfastness, constancy. The course is kept in

spite of all hindrances and difficulties. No effort is too severe, and no sacrifice is too great, if fidelity to the call demand it. Such endurance again is the fruit of faith. To illustrate by Paul's words, 'Our light affliction, which is for the moment, worketh for us more and more exceedingly an eternal weight of glory' (2 Co 4¹⁷). For faith, God is so real, and immortality so certain, that the sorrows and struggles of this earthly life, which is swiftly passing away, appear so insignificant that they cannot divert interest and effort away from the vocation, which has its beginning in God, and its end in immortality. Thus, alike by what he can surrender, and by what he can achieve in his Christian life, can a man find for himself and offer to others the verification of his faith.

Contributions and Comments.

Σκάνδαλον.

THE problem of this word has been discussed this month at the seminar which meets in connexion with the Hellenistic Department at Manchester University. This note is meant to prepare in advance for the excursus written by Archdeacon Willoughby Allen for his forthcoming book on the Gospel of Mark, in which he works out the tentative suggestion made at the seminar, and establishes it firmly, as it seems to me, on the basis of O.T. evidence. Dr. W. H. Bennett independently examined the O.T. evidence and came practically to the same conclusion.

I confine myself mainly to the Greek record. *Σκάνδαλον* is a word which Grimm describes as 'purely biblical and ecclesiastical,' for the Attic word denoting the stick of a mouse-trap. This occurs once only, in Aristophanes, *Acharn.* 687, *σκανδάληθρ' ἱστὰς ἐπὼν*, 'setting word-traps.' Pollux, the antiquary of ii A.D., interprets Aristophanes for us, and we have also scholia pointing the same way. Etymologically the meaning is guaranteed by the certain connexion with Skr. *skand*, 'leap, spirt,' Lat. *scando*, O. Ir. *scendim*, 'I spring': 'sudden motion' is the differentia of the root. It can hardly be doubted that *σκάνδαλον* existed before *σκανδάληθρον*, though not occurring in literature; we can see no other possible step between the root

σκανδ and the Aristophanic derivative. (Contrast the history of *ἀγάπη* as a shortening of *ἀγάπησις*, which I illustrated in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for December 1914.)

Now in eight of its LXX appearances *σκάνδαλον* renders *שִׁבְרָה*, a 'noose' or 'snare.' It is in company with *παγίς*, as in Jos 23¹⁸; and that it means something of the same kind is presumable, unless there is a mistranslation of the Hebrew. The only reason for suspecting this, or giving *σκάνδαλον* a double meaning, is the fact that in Lv 19¹⁴ and two other places it renders *מַכְשֹׁל*, a 'stumbling-block,' as also in Aquila's version of Is 8¹⁴; cf. the two N.T. citations of this passage. Since our purely Greek evidence is all for 'trap,' and a Hebrew word with this meaning accounts for the largest number of LXX occurrences of the noun, the question struck me whether *snare* might not be at least the normal meaning in N.T. A link between *snare* and *rock* might be imagined if we apply the principle of the modern mouse-trap on an enlarged scale: a carcass is placed in a large hole, a rock delicately poised just over it and kept from falling by a stick—the wild beast knocks the stick aside and brings the rock down on him. I suggested that in Lk 20¹⁸ the rock acts first as a *πρόσκομμα*, and then as a *σκάνδαλον*; cf. the combination in Ro 9³⁸, 1 P 2⁸.

If *σκάνδαλον* ever does mean *stumbling-block*, it

will be through the influence of what we may most probably call a mistranslation of מְכֻשָּׁל: it will be a real 'Biblical' sense, as due to a mistake which gained currency through appearing in the Bible—like our proverbial 'strain at a gnat,' which started from a misprint in the A.V. At a later time the N.T. use of the word gave birth to a new meaning in M. Gr. as in English *scandal* (cf. Thumb, *Hellenismus*, 123). But if we start from *snare* as the noun, we shall be surprised to find in how large a proportion of instances the sense of the passage will be improved, or at the least not damaged, by this rendering for both noun and verb. 'The *snare* of the cross' is perhaps the least obvious. But suppose we substitute מוֹקֵשׁ for מְכֻשָּׁל in Delitzsch's translation of 1 Co 1²³, would not the figure be quite rational? The Jew with his obstinate prejudice against the doctrine of a suffering Messiah thrusts his head into a noose, and unless he ceases to resist it will throttle him. So in Gal 5¹¹, the offensive doctrine must surely have 'ceased to work' as a 'snare,' if its great preacher is conceding the one thing about which Jews cared most; he may well ask why they go on persecuting him! I must not follow this up for other instances of σκάνδαλον and σκανδαλίζομαι, on which Archdeacon Allen's investigation will shed great light. But I should like to prepare the way for the discussion of it, and advance some considerations which lie outside the range of his excursus.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

Didsbury College, Manchester.

Genesis xli. 40.

THE R.V. renders as follows, 'Thou shalt be over my house, and according to thy word shall all my people be ruled: only in the throne will I be greater than thou.' The fault of this rendering is that the R.V., as is usually the case, ignores the emphasis of the Hebrew. If we were to retranslate the R.V., we should begin with *tih'ye* or *V'hāyitha*, but not with *atta tih'ye*, as the Hebrew does. This can only mean, 'It is thou that shalt be. . .'. And in this case the contrast is not between *atta* and *ani*, but between *atta* and *hak-kissē*. Now if the contrast were between *atta* and *ani*, the personal pronoun would be as necessary before 'egdal' as before *tih'ye*; moreover, a different order would be

required. I believe that אֲנִי is not the 1st sing. impfct. Qal, but the elative form of the adjective, and that the sentence should be translated, 'only the throne will be too great for thee.'

The elative form, *Eqtal* or *Aqtal* is well known in Arabic. It is the equivalent of the comparative and superlative forms. Although obsolete in Hebrew, it is still recognized in such forms as אֲכֹר, אֲכֹב, אֲיָתָן, and אֲרֵבָה. In the present instance, the form *Eqtāl* is nearer the original than the more usual *Eqtāl*. HERBERT LOEWE.

Exeter College, Oxford.

Judges xv. 8.

OF the *Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society* a mention was made in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (February, 1915), p. 195, where it was suggested that a new theory has been put forward about the Hebrew sentence of Jg 15⁸: וַיִּךְ אוֹתָם שׁוֹק עַל יֶרֶךְ מַכָּה נְדוּכָה. Mr. M. A. Canney says that this sentence is not accurately translated by the commentators. The R.V. has, 'And he smote them hip and thigh with a great slaughter.' We agree with Mr. Canney if he means by his 'inaccuracy of translation' that the word 'slaughter' used in the English Version is misleading, because a Semitic scholar is not immediately invited by the context to consider it as a simple noun of action of the verb 'he smote.' On the other hand, I cannot see any great possibility in the following statement: 'But the purpose of this note is to urge that probably all attempts to take *shōk* in the ordinary way are mistaken, and that in this passage the form may be not nominal but verbal. It may be the infinitive absolute of a verb *shūk*. Hebrew *shūk* would be equivalent to Arabic *sāka*' (pp. 87-88 of the above mentioned *Journal*).

The word מַכָּה which comes immediately after the curious English expression 'hip and thigh,' and which is a noun of action to the verb 'he smote,' would not suffer the probability of the existence of a second verb between them; the construction is in harmony with the genius of the Semitic languages, and we cannot deviate from it without strong philological evidence. Further, it is not elegant in the Semitic languages to move the not reduplicated 'weak letters,' in the verbs called *concave*, by heterogeneous vowels. In the

Arabic language which is claimed to support Mr. Canney's view, the letter *Waw*, when forming the second radical of a verb, is changed, in the present participle, into a *Hamza* written in form of *Yā'*. In Aramæo-Syriac,¹ it is changed also into a *Hamza-Alaph* or a *Yodh*. This principle is generally maintained in Hebrew where the *Waw* is simply eliminated. Why should we change it in this instance? and how can we translate *striking*? Finally, in the case of an infinitive absolute, a suffix-pronoun ought to link it with the first objective particle; and we have not in the sentence such a pronoun; and we cannot add it without modifying the whole construction.

We are not justified, therefore, in forging a new Hebrew and Aramaic verb to corroborate an attempt at interpretation which leaves the reason of the real meaning of the Semitic trope as problematic as it was before.

We welcome the new publication of the Young Oriental Society of Manchester, and we notice with great pleasure the note of originality which characterizes it. We hope soon to see its honourable members vying zealously with the greatest similar societies in Europe. In this they will be greatly helped by the John Rylands Library, which affords all desirable material in this branch of science.

A. MINGANA.

Woodbrooke, Selly Oak.

The Use of Enoch in St. Luke xvi. 19-31.

SOME interesting points are raised by the use of *ἄδης* in Lk 16²³. The word is not very common in the New Testament, occurring only ten times. The fact of its occurrence at all is, however, interesting, in view of the curious absence of the term from the papyri (cf. Moulton and Milligan, *Vocab. of Gk. Test., sub voc.*). It had apparently fallen out of use in the *κοινή*, if indeed it was ever more than a literary and rather poetical word.² In the

¹ For the Aramaic language which has in this point special morphological features, see our Syriac grammar, *Clef de la langue Araméenne*, Nos. 152-156, with the footnote, and No. 219 sqq.

² Its use on tombstones in Asia Minor (*vide* Moulton and Milligan, *loc. cit.*) suggests that it had remained in common use in formal religious phraseology, a fact which might account for its adoption as the LXX equivalent of She'ol.

LXX, however, it is the almost invariable equivalent of She'ol, and in the great majority of the cases where it occurs in the pre-Christian Greek Apocalypses and Apocrypha this usage is continued (cf. 2 Mac 6²³, 3 Mac 4⁸ 5^{42, 51} 6³¹, Sir 17^{19ff.} 21¹⁰, Wis 2¹ 16¹³, Sib. Or 1²² 5¹⁷⁸, *Test. XII. Patr.* Reub 4⁶, Levi 4¹, Benj 9⁵). It is thus natural to suspect that the New Testament use of *ἄδης* will follow the Old Testament use of She'ol. As a matter of fact this is only true in five out of the ten passages where the word occurs (Mt 11²³ 16¹⁸, Lk 10¹⁵, Ac 2^{27, 31}), and these all depend directly upon the Old Testament. Four of the remaining passages are in Revelation (1¹⁸ 6⁸ 20^{13, 14}), and here, strangely enough, the usage much more strongly resembles the semi-personified classical use of the term. There are, however, a few precedents for this, e.g. Sib. Or 3^{393, 458} and especially 4 Es 8⁵³, where 'infernum' probably stands for an original *ἄδης*; cf. also Wis 1¹⁴⁻¹⁶ 17¹⁴.

There remains the use of *ἄδης* in Lk 16¹⁹⁻³¹, the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. Here we are faced with the initial difficulty that it appears to be a place of torment, where the rich man is *ἐν βαράνοῖς*. A further problem arises in connexion with 'Abraham's bosom,' a phrase for which no very good parallel has been cited, and which leaves us in doubt whether we are to regard Lazarus also as being in Hades.

The use of *ἄδης* in this penal sense has practically no strict parallel. It is utterly unlike the rather classical usage of Revelation, and Ps. Sol 14⁶ ('Hades and darkness and destruction'), cf. 15¹¹, bears it little resemblance. She'ol, however, is used in a penal sense in En 63¹⁰ 99¹¹, and this suggests that the use of *ἄδης* in Lk 16²³ may perhaps be due to the influence of this ubiquitous book.

This, however, is a slight matter in itself. The search for further parallels to this parable in the Book of Enoch shows that however the actual use of the word *ἄδης* may be derived, a much more important influence has been exerted by the ideas and even by the language of ch. 16 ff. and especially of ch. 22. This contains the account of the strange mountain in the West, where the dead await the judgment. 'And there were four hollow places therein, deep and very smooth, three of them dark and one bright, with a spring of water in its midst. . . .' (Enoch then hears the voice of Abel calling for vengeance until the seed of Cain is exterminated from the earth.) . . . 'Then I

asked about the hollows (reading *κοιλωμάτων*), διὰ τί ἐχωρίσθησαν ἐν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνός; And he answered me saying, These four (three?) were made χωρίζεσθαι τὰ πνεύματα τῶν νεκρῶν. This one was divided off for the souls of the just, wherein is the bright spring of water. And this one was made for sinners ὅταν ἀποθάνωσιν καὶ ταφῶσιν εἰς τὴν γῆν and judgment has not been done on them ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτῶν. Here are separated their souls εἰς τὴν μεγάλην βάσανον ταύτην, until the great day of judgment, of scourges and tortures of the accursed for ever ἢ ἀνταπόδοσις τῶν πνευμάτων' (so Dr. Charles. Reading *ad fin.* corrupt).

It seems very probable that the parable Lk 16¹⁰⁻³¹ contains reminiscences of this passage (and its context) both in idea and in language.

(1) 'Abraham's bosom' suggests the first of the four compartments, bright, and with the spring of water from which Dives craved a drop. The parallel would be the more striking if it were clear that this division was for the righteous unjustly slain, but the case of Abel comes in quite disconnectedly in Enoch. In Enoch, however, the emphasis on the water is marked. The water is perhaps meant to be magical 'water of life' (mentioned in En 16⁴), and if so the strange *καταψύξη* of Lk 16²⁴, which suggests the complete quenching of the rich man's thirst, is explained.¹

(2) The Enoch passage lays great stress upon the separation of the souls in the different divisions. This is obviously parallel to the *χάσμα μέγα* of Lk 16²⁶; and this phrase, unique in the New Testament, actually occurs in the context in Enoch (18¹¹, where indeed there is a further parallel since Enoch speaks of looking ἐπέκεινα τοῦ χάσματος to a τόπος ἔρημος καὶ φοβερός). And is there an echo of the *στήριγμα* of En 18⁵ in the curious *ἐστήρικται* of Lk 16²⁶?

(3) The second of the four divisions in En 22 seems exactly made for the case of the rich man. It is assigned to those who die and are buried, a curiously close parallel to the *ἀπέθανε . . . καὶ ἐτάφη* of Lk 16²², where the mention of burial is not otherwise easy to explain. Judgment has not been done upon them ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτῶν, a phrase recalled in Lk 16²⁵ ἐν τῇ ζωῇ σου. This parallel is very striking, since the use of *ζωή* in this sense of 'life-time' is almost if not quite unique in the New Testament. 1 Co 15¹⁹ and, less clearly, 1 Ti 4⁸, are the only passages which show any resemblance

to this usage. Again, only in this division in Enoch are the spirits ἐν βασάνοις. *βάσανος*, used of future torment, occurs only in this parable in the New Testament, Lk 16^{23, 28}. It occurs once in another sense in Mt 4²⁴. The definite *τῆς βασάνου* in Lk 16²⁸ perhaps suggests the influence of some well-known account of the next world.

(4) The final *ἀνταπόδοσις τῶν πνευμάτων* suggests the very moral of the parable.

It seems difficult to believe that these are all accidental coincidences, especially in the case of the words *χάσμα*, *ζωή*, and *βάσανος*. But if not we must conclude that the whole parable is based on Enoch, and, in particular, the problem whether Lazarus was also ἐν τῷ ᾧδῳ has found its solution.

L. W. GRENSTED.

Egerton Hall, Manchester.

Reminiscence of Rabbi Duncan.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for November 1914, the 'Great Text' is Ro 5²⁰, and the translation of the Revised Version is used—'And the law came in beside, that the trespass might abound; but where sin abounded, grace did abound more exceedingly.' Whenever that text comes before me, I always remember a translation which the late Rabbi Duncan gave us, namely, 'And the law came in *by the by*.' He was speaking of The Entrance of Sin and Death, The Entrance of the Law, and The Entrance of Righteousness and Life. Sin entered (*εἰσῆλθε*), and Law came in *by the by* (*παρεισῆλθε*). A few words of comment showed the appropriateness and the force of this translation. This remembered translation recalled a few other sayings of the Rabbi which may even at this date interest some readers.

Dr. Duncan died in February 1870, and he was only ten or twelve times with the Senior Hebrew Class during that session in which he died. One had often heard of his eccentric ways, and how he sometimes forgot himself in the opening prayer; occasionally, to the delight of some at any rate, occupying thus a good part of the hour. He had great facility also in using Latin synonyms to bring out the exact shade of meaning he wished to convey. On one occasion he began the opening prayer with the class in these words, 'O Lord, thou art worthy to be feared—*VENERANDUS*.' He had great delight in expounding the Psalms; and

¹ I owe this suggestion to Dr. W. H. Bennett.

his remarks were often very helpful, and illuminating. For instance, in Ps 1², we have the statement, 'and in his law doth he meditate day and night.' On this he remarked to this effect:—To meditate is to mutter. In the East when men meditate they mutter. A Jew always when he meditates mutters. Silent meditation is owing to our Occidental civilization. And to make perfectly clear what he meant he sat down in his chair, and leaning back muttered away to himself, audibly but indistinctly. Thus he pictured a meditating Jew.

He liked to speak of the JEHOVAHISM of the Psalms. He gave the subject of the first Psalm as Jehovah's Man; of the second as Jehovah's Messiah; and of the third as Jehovah's Salvation. He described this Liturgical Book of Psalms as related to the Torah and Nabiim (the Law and the Prophets), as the responses of the congregation of Israel to the voice of God, speaking to them in the Torah, and in his peculiar providence as explicated by the Torah and the Prophets. Among pious Israelites was a deep sensibility to the light of

Jehovah's countenance. 'When he shone upon them, they raised jubilant hallelujahs; when he hid his face they were troubled. On his excellencies they dwelt with rapture, on his mighty works for Israel with warmest gratitude.'

I am afraid the learned Rabbi had no great regard for the extreme Higher Criticism, which he perhaps considered to be 'made in Germany.' Once at least he sarcastically represented some of the extremists as saying, 'They didn't know everything down in Judee.' He was greatly attached to his students, and they to him. He would gladly tell when he went home, 'My laddies gave me a cheer to-day.' When he spake to themselves in the class, he addressed them as 'Dear young Gentlemen.' And it was fine to hear him speak of his colleague in the chair, Dr. Davidson, as 'My Beloved Colleague.' All our recollections of Rabbi Duncan make us think of the great man and profound thinker and spiritual genius as like a little child in the kingdom of heaven.

Edinburgh.

JAMES MATTHEW.

Entre Nous.

A Chinese Hastings.

This is the title of a pamphlet which has been sent by Dr. Timothy Richard of the Chinese Literature Society, Shanghai. This is the pamphlet—

'When Dr. Hastings' Five-volume *Dictionary of the Bible* began to appear in 1900, it was at once perceived that it marked a great advance on its predecessors, and many a missionary longed to see such parts of his work as were suitable for the use of our Chinese fellow-labourers turned into Chinese and placed at their disposal. Of course the books contained a vast deal which would be wholly indigestible to the Chinese, even if all were agreed that many of the new theories would find a congenial atmosphere here. At the same time one longed to see the undoubted wheat which laded the pages of Hastings prepared for Chinese consumption. Accordingly a few trial articles were translated and appeared in our Society's Church paper, "The Missionary Review." But those were pre-Revolution days, and nothing further was done at the time. Meantime reform was making steady headway, and the Chinese Church was constantly increasing in quantity and quality. It looked to

us to give them the best we knew. Then came the revolution. The Church advanced by leaps and bounds. Chinese leadership became more prominent than ever. The needs of the preachers immersed in a new atmosphere became more clamant. They demanded our best. They now see that much that formerly used to be done for them they ought to do for themselves. But our knowledge and experience of Christian Truth is acknowledged to be deeper and riper than theirs, and the work of giving them a new Bible Dictionary is something that we can and ought to do.

'Then in 1906 appeared the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* which is the very department most necessary for the Chinese Church. After that came the opening volumes of the great *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, and finally in 1909 the one-volume Dictionary. All of these furnished us with an embarrassment of riches. The time seemed ripe to attempt to give the Chinese Church a really helpful Dictionary, and this was the unanimous view of the various Conferences held recently under the Presidency of Dr. Mott. By general consent the C. L. S. was looked

to as the likeliest agency to produce the book, and our interest in the project became intensified when we discovered that India had stolen a march on us and had already a Tamil Hastings' Dictionary.

'Of course the Home Dictionaries were prepared for the ministers of the Home Churches, and some of the articles are meant for highly educated men. As has been truly said, the writers of the articles in Hastings did not write for the Chinese Church. Our work will, therefore, differ very materially from theirs inasmuch as our writers will always keep in mind the average Chinese Christian, and especially the average helper or pastor. The standard of education among them is as yet not very high, and we will always be in danger of giving them stones instead of bread. Still, the attempt is to be made to supply a Dictionary in which the general point of view is modern, and yet is sufficiently easy Chinese to be understood of those upon whom the great burden of evangelizing their country will more and more be thrust.

'It will thus be seen that our general object is not the dissemination of the latest continental theories, but a practical help to the Chinese workers. As the "Suggestions for the Guidance of Translators" states, "The general object of the work is to provide the Chinese pastor and leader with the best aids known to devout scholarship for the reverent understanding of the Sacred Scriptures. The chief aim is practical, and the emphasis will therefore be on the New Testament. In the carrying out of this object much consecrated common sense and hard work will be necessary, but we owe it to the Church to make the attempt."

'The problem before us now is how to secure this general object. The most of the work will be done by the staff of the C. L. S. It will, in fact, be a C. L. S. Hastings, but a goodly number of co-labourers have already promised their assistance for various articles. A common basis and method of procedure in the work has been agreed on, so that it is hoped that the work may be portioned out to the translators at the beginning of the coming autumn. If our plans are successfully carried out, the resultant Dictionary ought to be richer and more serviceable to the Chinese than a literal translation of any one original. In this connection it should be added that a considerable number of special articles, not found in any foreign Bible Dictionary, will be prepared with Chinese readers especially in view.

'As many of the pastors are poorly paid, it is highly desirable that the Society be enabled to issue the work at an exceedingly moderate price. The probable cost of an edition of 3000 copies, with stereos, maps, and plates will be £600. A gift of £200 in memoriam has already been given us for the purpose of helping the publication of the Dictionary. This very early and timely gift we take as a sign of God's blessing on the undertaking, so we thank God and take courage.

'The work of the editors and translators will be difficult and delicate. Many problems will need divine wisdom for the right solution. Let me therefore ask our readers to remember these workers in prayer, so that this great undertaking may be crowned with the divine blessing. It may possibly be the greatest single contribution to the Church of China which this Society has ever been privileged to make.'

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. John T. Montgomery, Quigley's Point, Co. Donegal.

Illustrations for the Great Text for May must be received by the 20th of March. The text is Ph 2⁵⁻⁸.

The Great Text for June is Ph 2⁹⁻¹¹—'Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' A copy of Rutherford's *The Seer's House*, or of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. More than one illustration may be sent by one person for the same text. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.